NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXLI.

AUGUST, 1893.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

I.—THE PRESENT CRISIS.

BY THE HON. JAMES H. ECKELS, COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

THE present financial depression differs materially from any that has heretofore occurred in our history. The strain has been of unprecedented length and great severity, but there has been nothing approaching a panic, such as characterized other years under similar circumstances. More significant is the fact that throughout it all there has been manifest no unusual excitement, despite the general distrust in the stability of our moneyed institutions evidenced in every portion of the country; the daily failure of banks, national, state and private; of great commercial enterprises, trust companies and corporations and manufacturing establishments. No stronger proof than this could be had of the vast resources of the country and the available wealth of the people. It demonstrates that no matter how bad the outlook there can be no general bankruptcy and distress like that of 1837, 1857 and 1873.

In all the circumstances surrounding the present situation it is equally at variance with other periods of liquidation. It has

Copyright, 1893, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developed at a time when there is an abundance of agricultural produce and of manufactured product on every hand. Ordinary business in mercantile lines is up to, and in some trades above, the standard of the same months in times of marked prosperity, while the actual amount of money in circulation *per capita* is as great as that of recent years. Not less worthy of note is it that, in a majority of the failures that have occurred in legitimate lines thus far, the assets reported of the failed concerns have been largely in excess of their liabilities and of such a character as to cause comment that institutions holding them should have been forced to suspend.

As these facts come to the knowledge of the people the situation is slowly but surely undergoing a change for the better. It is true it is not a radical one, but it is sufficiently notable to attract the attention of even a casual observer. Evidence of this improved condition is plainly apparent. The people are getting over their scare sufficiently well to calmly take an inventory of the solvent institutions that are in every State and Territory, and to realize that they are so far in excess of the numbers that have been forced to the wall that many more might be put into liquidation and our country still remain the wealthiest in all the catalogue. They are coming to know that many of the failed institutions are in sections of the country where booms have been the order of the day and legitimate business growth looked upon as quite out of date. They are turning to staid New England and observing that not a national bank within her borders has closed its doors; that but two have gone into liquidation in New York, one through misuse of the privileges so easily granted those connected with the institutions, and the other because of mismanagement; none in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Minnesota and other Northwestern and Western States, and that the failures in the South are but few. They have learned that the three in Illinois, one of which carried down a now re-opened bank in Indiana, were forced to suspend more because of internal causes than from outside pressure, and that the same causes worked the failures of one in Ohio, one in Indiana, two in Michigan, three in the Dakotas, one in Kansas, three in Nebraska, two in Georgia, three in Texas, and one in North Carolina, and that two in Tennessee, one in Montana and one in Utah were wrecked by peculations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They have also noted in the States of Washington and California the resultant effects of laying out cities for future purposes instead of present needs in the breaking of banks that carried paper of the projectors of such magnificence, while to the sudden drop in silver they have charged all the failures in Colorado, one in Montana, one in New Mexico and one in Utah. Re-opened banks in Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, California, Washington, Florida and Kentucky under favorable conditions and of greater strength, too, have reassured the public.

Turning from a study of the causes which, under unfavorable circumstances more quickly than would have otherwise have been the case, revealed the weak places in a great banking system, to the financial reports they find that gold is coming into the country in small amounts instead of going out in large ones, that the rate of exchange is lower, that our breadstuffs are again in demand in European countries and that the balance of trade is once more slightly in our favor; that the tone of the press, the best of indicators, is reassuring, while the views of our public men and acknowledged financiers are hopeful and confident. The action of the President in calling Congress together in an extraordinary session at an early date, to consider financial legislation, has been of incalculable benefit in quieting the people's fears and improving the business outlook. It has imbued not alone the many in great business undertakings but all classes with the belief that the radically bad legislation of three years since is to be speedily undone, and strong in this belief they are looking forward with confident hope to August 7. When to all these sources of encouragement are added the further ones that the banks are loaning more freely, that frightened depositors who withdrew their money are redepositing it with the same institutions, that the savings institutions are again putting out money, that millions of new currency are being ordered for circulation by national banks upon bonds deposited, that there is less call upon the East for help on the part of the West and South, and that the borrower can secure accommodation on bonds other than those of the United States, there are indications of better times in the near future that must convince even the most pessimistic.

All these favorable symptoms must not, however, be interpreted to signify immediate and complete restoration to health. The ailment from which our financial system has so long suffered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is too deep-seated to warrant the hope of a recovery without a period of convalescence. The crisis is passed, but an imprudent act or failure to take every precautionary measure may cause a relapse which, in its consequences, may prove more serious than the fever when at its height. It has taken a long period of time to pervert the minds of the people in business matters and to thoroughly permeate the financial system of the United States with the disease that has so nearly ruined it, and of necessity it cannot all be undone in the twinkling of an eye. It did not commence with the passage of "the Sherman Silver Act," nor with the passage of the "Bland Act." It found its origin long before either was enacted, at a time when Congress first assumed it to be the chief end of legislation to make, through enacted laws, certain individuals rich. It was with this end in view that protective tariff laws were passed and for this purpose was brought into being the Silver bill, which has not only now returned to plague its authors, but is destroying the very interest it was designed to benefit. Such legislation is responsible for the spirit of speculation that would create something out of nothing; that organizes trusts for the purpose of enriching a few at the expense of many, and looks upon the general public, not less than the public's interests, as legitimate plunder. It has popularized an extravagance in public and private expenditure that has led the government in its public matters and the individual in his private affairs to live beyond their means. It has done more to strangle the life of legitimate trade than all else combined, and to-day the people are seeing the full effects of the evil in the menace to honest endeavors through the distrust bred by it.

The passage of the "Sherman Act" was but the culmination of the idea of enriching through protective legislation. No other excuse can be or has been offered for its enactment, except the disreputable one of political advantage. It is a regretful commentary upon the sense of duty which a distinguished representative must hold toward his constituents and the interests of the public when we find him saying, in the course of an able and exhaustive speech upon the passage of this law, in which he condemned it as unwise, but yet declared his intention to vote for it:

"It is pure politics, gentlemen; that is all there is about it. We Republicans want to come back, and we do not want you Democrats to come back in the majority. That is all there is to this silver bill—pure politics."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the light of the subsequent disaster wrought by this measure, the public may well believe that such politics was not only not "pure" politics, but wretchedly bad politics, unworthy the representative of any great organization.

Not only was the "Sherman Act" the last embodiment of this ruinous idea, but the worst. Aside from the protective feature of it, the only effect that could possibly result from it was injury to our own financial system. In the face of this danger the opportunity was embraced for the unworthy purpose of gaining supposed political advantage. It was so clearly in violation of every fixed principle of finance that its authors knowing it then are apologizing for it now. Its passage was notice to the world of business that the people of the United States believed they could maintain two standards, one of a cheap and the other of a dear metal, in defiance of the single standard of all other civilized nations. It was heroic, but it was the heroism of foolhardiness and ill-considered action.

The consequence of this assumption is now so plain that "he who runs may read." The seed of distrust then planted has sprung into life and its huge proportions have called to action the bankers, merchants, professional men, farmers and laboring men. It has created in the largest degree to-day's disturbed conditions. The bill had not passed the Senate before the leading economists of Europe commenced to discuss the inevitable result of its operation upon the finances of this country. The late Adolf Soetbeer, the most distinguished German authority on the question of monetary standards, writing of it in the *Neue Freie Presse,* under date of June 21, 1890, said :

"Face to face with these optimistic expectations, stand many and great causes of apprehension. First of all and above all, it is doubted whether it will be possible to keep silver at the par of 129 cents per ounce of fine silver permanently, even if it could during the first few years be raised to that figure for a time by the colossal purchase of silver by the Treasury, provided for in the bill. Despite the increase of population and wealth, the fear is expressed that by the compulsory increase of the circulating medium to the extent of about 40 millions of dollars a year, and eventually of more, in silver currency, the want of such a medium will be greatly exceeded and gold driven from the country. An advancing and fluctuating gold premium will not fail to appear, and the real value of silver, measured by the universal measure of value, gold, will then, perhaps, sink permanently lower than it has risen at first, for a certain time, under the direct influence of the new silver bill. The new silver bill, it is claimed, must be considered as a very rash experiment, which, on the whole and in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the long run, will scarcely produce the extraordinary advantages expected from it, but which will, rather, after a time, cause much greater damage.

"It will not be expected of a calm, dispassionate observer, competent to form a judgment on such matters, that he will, at this stage of the case, give expression to a positive opinion as to which of these directly opposite views and expectations will turn out right, or as to whether, as so frequently happens, the probable effects of the new law are not estimated much too favorably by the one side and much too unfavorably by the other. Considering the many powerful factors that co-operate to produce a result in nearly all great economic questions, the only thing to do, in most instances, is to form an opinion for one's self as to how small or how great the probability of the indirect effects to be anticipated from a far-reaching law is. Experience teaches how different the course of things is in reality, from what many had at first prophesied with the greatest confidence. . . .

"It seems, as already remarked, rash and premature, thus early to pass judgment on the effects of the new American silver bill; but, hereafter, people will not be able to refrain examining in detail the influence and the consequences of this law, in the light of experience and of sound monetary political principles, for it is a law of vast practical importance and destined to influence greatly the commercial and financial interests of all countries."

Further, he says, illustrating the view that England and Germany would take of it (and those who are now talking about a conspiracy on the part of those countries against silver may read what was then said by one who was not a politician, but an economist, viewing the whole subject in its true light):

"It is safe to say that the advocates of bimetallism in Germany are completely mistaken when they think or claim that the course the silver question has taken in the United States has been disagreeable to the defenders of the gold standard in Germany and England, and that it disappoints their endeavors. How such an opinion could be formed or find expression is inconceivable. Nothing is clearer or better known than that Mr. Goschen, the British Minister of Finance, has, since 1878, harbored no more ardent wish with regard to the question of standard than that the double standard might be maintained in other large states and might oppose the depreciation of silver, without England herself needing to change its existing single-gold standard in any way, and that, with respect to the financial relations of British India, it would be only too welcome to him if the monetary policy of the United States would now bring about the rehabilitation of silver. And that Germany has as little interest in the depreciation of silver for its own sake as England and would gladly see the stability of the price of silver practically restored by the monetary legislation of the United States is just as undoubted. If the United States silver bill has the success expected by the bimetallists, Germany will then be afforded the best opportunity to get rid of the superfluous silver thalers it has left without loss and to obtain gold in exchange for them; Germany would then, to use the language of the bimetallists, give up the undecided and wavering policy she has pursued in the matter of the standard. If, in this way, the Soetbeer-Bamberg era,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during which Germany was hoodwinked by a small number of doctrinarian theorizers, comes to a close, the defenders of the gold standard will not have the least ground or reason to lament the 'victory of bimetallism,' which will have materially facilitated the final and complete establishment of the gold standard in Germany."

And again, under date of July 29, 1890, he says:

"The monetary system of the United States will then be delivered over to the greatest uncertainty, and the value of silver depressed lower than it has now been raised, or will be raised in the near future. Under any and all circumstances, gold will assert for itself the place of the universal measure of value and the ultimate medium of exchange; and the international trade of the United States, even if the silver standard rules there in the future in home trade, will not be able to escape it."

The same writer again discussing the reasons for and against the Sherman Act makes the following statement, under date of August 7, 1890:

"In the above, we have only called attention to a few points of view from which the silver question may be looked at in connection with the new United States silver law. The result is the probability of a temporary rise of silver, but the total uncertainty of the height and duration of such a rise in value, as well as of the future use of an actual silver standard in the business of the banks, especially after there has come to be a premium on gold. Be this as it may, the conviction that gold will not cease to remain the universal measure of value, and that, to accomplish that end, it will have to assert itself as the ultimate medium of exchange, cannot be removed or even shaken by the monetary legislation of any country."

And again, under date of August 10, 1890, he states:

"In the meanwhile, in the uncertain state of things created by the United States Silver Law, the business world must and will have to do the best it can and await the further practical consequences of the law and the further development of the financial situation of the United States, cautiously and patiently."

It would be well if our public men would take these statements made before the "Sherman Act" had been fairly put in operation and study them. They are deductions made from the business world's experience with silver and have proven so true in the case in hand as to challenge admiration.

Not less true has proven the prediction of the *Economist* (England) under date of June 19, 1890:

"It is always rash to prophesy, and the effects of currency changes are so complicated and far-reaching, that it is impossible to say beforehand what new influences may be brought into operation. But all the probabili-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties point to the conclusion that sooner or later, and probably not later than two or three years hence, the United States Treasury will be forced to cease its silver purchases; and seeing that in the interval production will have been stimulated, and the general demand diminished, the withdrawal of that factitious support to the silver market will cause prices to fall to a lower level than that from which they have been raised."

Nor are we wanting among the distinguished financiers of our own country for testimony as to the ultimate result of such law: and therefore ignorance of its effect cannot be pleaded by those responsible for its becoming a law. Senator Sherman, whose authority upon financial questions is recognized at home and abroad, in a public address delivered at Cumberland, Md., October 24, 1878, in discussing "the condition of the country," said, relative to the effect of the then recent silver legislation—and what was said by him then was doubly applicable to the "Sherman Act":

"I am frequently asked whether we can maintain the equality of this money after resumption. I say, without hesitation, that we can do so; but we must not force the issue of either form of money when its convenience, the popular demand for it, and the separate uses for which it is designed, will not keep it at par with the other."

And, in the same address, he adds:

"The coinage of 2,000,000 monthly of silver dollars of full legal tender is a disturbing element, which we cannot now compute. We can only hope that, before the issue of silver is greatly increased, Congress will either limit its amount or make it contain enough silver to be equal in value to gold. . . . I therefore say with confidence, that, unless the people prefer irredeemable money, we will have redeemable money at par with gold coin, unless the people demand that silver coin of a kind less valuable than gold coin shall be issued in such quantities as to drive out of circulation gold coin and thus become the sole standard of value."

Afterwards, in his annual report to Congress as Secretary of the Treasury, under date of December 2, 1878, Senator Sherman said:

"Experience, not only in this country, but in European countries, has established that a certain amount of silver coin may be maintained in circulation at par with gold, though of less intrinsic bullion value. It was, no doubt, the intention of Congress to provide a coin in silver which would answer a multitude of the purposes of business life, without banishing from circulation the established gold coin of the country. To accomplish this, it is indispensable either that the silver coin be limited in amount, or that its bullion value be equal to that of the gold dollar. If not, its use will be limited to domestic purposes only. It can not be exported except at its commercial value as bullion. If issued in excess of demands for domestic purposes, it will necessarily fall in market value, and by a well-known

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principle of finance will become the sole coin standard of value. Gold will be either hoarded or exported. When two currencies, both legal, are authorized without limit, the cheaper alone will circulate. . . . To the extent that such demand will give employment to silver dollars, their use will be an aid to resumption rather than a hindrance; but, if issued in excess of such demand, they will at once tend to displace gold and become the sole standard, and gradually as they increase in number, will fall to their value as bullion. Even the fear or suspicion of such an excess tends to banish gold, and, if well established, will cause a continuous drain of gold, until imperative necessity will compel resumption in silver alone. The serious effects of such a radical change in our standards of value cannot be exaggerated; and its possibility will greatly disturb confidence in resumption, and may make necessary larger reserves and further sales of bonds.

"The Secretary therefore earnestly invokes the attention of Congress to this subject, with a view that either during the present or the next session the amount of silver dollars to be issued be limited, or their ratio to gold for coining purposes be changed."

The result of such discussion not only made Europeans cautious of the operations of the act, but as its disastrous effects became more and more apparent a distrust in the ability of the Government to maintain gold payments developed to such an extent that a steady drain was commenced on the gold of this country until the reserve was broken into that the credit of the Government might be maintained. Two years of continuous purchase of unused silver with gold has given us no benefit on the one hand, while on the other it has worked serious harm to every branch of business. The distrust of Europe found ready harbor here, and because of it the financial interests of the country have not only been threatened, but seriously impaired.

It would be unfair, however, to charge in its entirety the present condition to a single cause. There must be taken into account as contributing elements, unwise speculations; great extravagances; the carrying of competition in trade and finance to dangerous limits, and the giving of unlimited credit to those engaged in purely speculative enterprises that have proved disastrous. But neither one nor all of these combined could have in a much longer period of time brought the country to its present state. The essential thing for the highest good of a people is to have an absolutely sound system of finance. The laws governing finance are more important than those regulating revenue or the conduct of government. They are the very basis of a nation's prosperity. The laws regulating monetary operations must conform to and aid the laws of commerce and trade, rather than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conflict with and retard them in their operation. No nation can subvert the immutable laws that govern the world's trade. To-day that law decrees a gold standard as the basis of its operations, and until that standard shall be changed by the common consent of all to a bimetallic one the United States must conform to it or suffer in the strife for wealth. There may be those of our people who have, as Andrew Johnson once suggested, discovered "the philosopher's stone," but he believed, as he expressed it, that:

"Congress cannot regulate the value of these coins, because the commercial world will take the coins for what they are intrinsically worth, and not for what the legal stamp represents them to be worth."

It is one of the incredible things that, in the United States, where we boast so much of advance in all that makes a country great among the nations, the chimera of a universal bimetallic standard is pursued under present circumstances, while other governments are fleeing from it. Of such standard Moritz Beneditkt, editor of the *Neue Freie Presse* and member of the Austrian Monetary Reform Committee, said, at a meeting of the Committee on March 8, 1891:

"The end which the greater number of civilized countries have endeavored to reach during the last twenty years by their reforms of the standard may be described in a few words: *To cut loose from the pale of silver.* . . . Bimetallism is not only impracticable, but nobody has any confidence in it. Pirmez said at the Paris Monetary Conference in 1881: 'Bimetallism demands that those states which have already too much silver shall take more silver.' Bimetallists wish to correct the superfluity of silver by a still greater superfluity. This kind of homœopathy is impossible, because, at bottom, bimetallism has no foundation except the hope of Americans to be able to send their silver to Europe, and the hope of the French to ship their silver to America."

But a short time intervenes before the session of Congress. No body of men ever met with the people more deeply interested in their labors. The people now believe that the "Sherman Act" will be repealed, and in that hope have undertaken with renewed courage the task of maintaining the solvency of bank and factory and the thousand lines of commerce in which a busy people are engaged. The force of present public sentiment is emphatic for repeal, and the lesson of past experience points to the necessity of it. It will not come because of party caucus or of political de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bate, but as the result of the patriotism of legislators who are bent upon serving the best interests of the people whose representatives they are. It will be remembered as the most costly piece of experimental legislation ever undertaken, and the last which juggled with the business interests of a whole nation for the sake of retaining the distribution of patronage. Its abolishment will forever divorce questions of finance from questions of political power, and bring about the solution of them in accordance with the rules of commerce and trade.

Many are looking for an immediate and spontaneous return of good times when this law is off the statute books, but such a thing is as impossible as is the maintenance of it without working greater harm. Those who oppose its repeal will not yield at once and without resistance. The struggle for the use of the "white metal" commenced in 1877, when Senator Jones made his famous report, and is not now to be abandoned without resistance, but in the end its opponents must be beaten, for no set of men ever yet have defeated the force of public opinion. The return to a sound basis will be slow, but when once upon it the American people will be immeasurably more prosperous than during these past years of speculative and fictitious values.

JAMES H. ECKELS.

AFTER THE FOUR HUNDRED YEARS, WHAT?

BY THE HON. SYLVESTER PENNOYER, GOVERNOR OF OREGON.

THERE is now progressing at Chicago a most remarkable Fair in honor of one of the most remarkable events in the world's history. The erection there of vast but meretricious buildings apeing, in the splendor of lath and plaster, wood, white paint and stucco, the most costly and stable edifices which have been the slow result of the patient labor and architectural genius of the ages, involved the expenditure of millions of money, some of which was appropriated by Congress without warrant of law, as no such expenditure was provided for in the grant of its delegated powers, and some by the legislatures of States in defiance of justice, as no man who cannot visit the Fair ought to be taxed for the benefit of the man who can. Such taxation contrasts most strongly and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strangely with the fact that the money raised to fit out Columbus for his contemplated voyage was not by the taxation of her subjects, but by the pledge of her private jewels by the Queen of Castile, and also elucidates the further fact, not generally known and understood, that in the prostitution of its taxing powers our government, believed to be the best the world ever saw, easily bears the palm against all existing monarchies as well as those of the past ages.

This Fair is in honor of the discovery of America by Columbus four hundred years ago. No event in the whole world's history, save alone the wonderful birth at Bethlehem over eighteen centuries ago, was clothed with greater and more momentous consequences. At the time when Columbus set sail the so-called civilized world was still encompassed in the gloom of the dark ages. For nearly fifteen centuries the splendid civilization attained in Greece and Rome had been gradually but surely declining. Civilization had retrograded, commerce had fallen into comparative decay, the arts had declined, while the people had sunk into a hopeless condition of serfdom. All this every student of history well knows, but as every student is not well aware of the great producing cause of this decline from the magnificent splendor of Grecian and Roman civilization to the gloom and ignorance and semi-barbarism of the succeeding ages, it will be most pertinent to state that such a decline was the direct result of a diminution in the volume of money, which is the very life blood of commerce and progress. The experience of the whole world has shown that where money is plentiful there the arts flourish, the people are prosperous, and nations march forward to greater achievements, but when its volume diminishes a decline in the condition of the people follows as surely as night follows the day. While the gold and silver mines of Greece and Spain yielded their precious treasures, Rome prospered; when they failed, Rome declined.

At the commencement of the Christian era, which occurred at the very apex of Roman greatness, the coined money of the Roman empire was estimated at $1,800,000,000, while at the time Columbus set sail from Palos the estimated coined money of all Christendom was estimated at less than $200,000,000. The result of the gradual diminution of the volume of the world's money is legibly written on the pages of history in a decline in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the condition of the people. There it stands and there it will ever stand both as an instruction and a warning. When we look about us now, at the close of the nineteenth century, and mark the great fact standing out in bold relief, that the noblest progress has been made where the Christian religion obtains the greatest sway, the other grave fact that the commencement of the decline into the gloom of the dark ages was contemporaneous with the announcement of the great truths of that religion gives irrefutable testimony to the undeniable truth that such a decline must alone have been the result of the steady diminution in the volume of the world's money.

When Columbus set sail upon the Western ocean, in search of new lands, the great impelling cause was the hope that the world could be further supplied with the precious metals. They were the imperative need of the people and the hope of the nations. With them in abundance, the lethargic sleep of the ages would be broken, the shackles would be removed from the oppressed, and new life and energy would be given both to nations and to individuals. That was their hope and their yearning. His voyage was successful and a new world was discovered. For what was the first search made by Columbus and his followers when once they had planted their feet on the virgin soil of San Salvador, and for what, immediately following, were countless expeditions fitted out to explore the new and unknown world? It was for those metals for which the people of the old world stood in most urgent need. And under the providence of God the discovery of gold and silver in rich abundance in the Western world was indeed one of the greatest boons ever conferred upon mankind.

Contemporaneously with the sailing of Columbus the coined money of the world had passed under the control of a class of men who thereby had become the virtual masters of the world, holding both nations and individuals under their relentless domination. The discovery of the precious metals in the Western hemisphere broke the bands of this slavery and disenthralled Europe from its abject condition of money servitude.

The discovery of the new world, with its wealth of the precious metals, is one of the most prominent landmarks in the world's history. From its date began the dawning of a wonderful advancement, constant, though perhaps irregular, until we stand now in the full glare of the splendid achievements which mark

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the close of the nineteenth century. For fifteen centuries the world was gradually lapsing into barbarism, owing to a constant diminution of money. For four centuries it has leaped with giant bounds in the arena of progress, having been generously supplied by an all-wise Providence with a plentiful store of those metals. And now at the end of the four hundred years we may be standing at another great landmark in the world's history. The cupidity of the money lords would, if possible, render void the beneficence of Almighty God. The precious metals, gold and silver, which Providence has most graciously stored in our mountain sides and in the bowels of the earth for the benefit of mankind, and all of which the ever-increasing population and ever-developing resources of the world urgently need and imperatively demand, are deemed by them as being too large in volume for their selfish interests, and at their behest the nations of the world have demonetized one of these metals and are endeavoring to do the business of the world with one metal alone. The stupendous folly and colossal crime of this policy can be seen at a glance, when we remember that the world's supply of gold is estimated at $3,700,000,000 and that the grand total of the national indebtedness aggregates over $35,000,000,000. These debts, as well as the debts of corporations and private individuals, are now all made payable in gold. No mountebank ever imposed upon a credulous auditory a more transparent fraud than the attempt to do the world's business on a gold basis. The two drunken louts who of a cold winter night discarded one blanket because it was white and struggled and shivered under one yellow blanket, too short and too narrow to cover them both, were not one whit more foolish than is our government in discarding the broad bi-metallic basis of our fathers and adopting the single gold basis entirely inadequate to the demands of our increasing population and our yet undeveloped resources.

And now mark the result of this criminal policy of denying the use of silver as full legal-tender money. It is seen and felt on every hand. It is plainly written in a steady decline in business, in the fall of prices and in the constant accessions to the already vast army of the unemployed. It is estimated that the fall in the value of the listed and unlisted stocks handled on Wall Street since the first day of the present year aggregates about $500,000,000. But even this decline is trivial and comparatively

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

harmless compared with the other consequences of the demonetization of silver. It may perhaps be that the fall in some stocks is only a healthful wringing out of water, and, although individuals may suffer, it may perhaps be of ultimate benefit, while other stocks undoubtedly have declined through a loss of earning power in the corporations issuing them, resultant upon the general stagnation of business. It is, however, among the producing and laboring classes that this denial of the use of one of the precious metals as full legal-tender money is most severely felt. Gold alone, instead of both gold and silver, has become the measure of the value of property and the basis of business. And, as this is greatly insufficient to keep our ever-expanding industries in activity, they are being dwarfed to a conformity with the dwarfed basis. The prices of the farmer's produce, of the artisan's and mechanic's productions, and of the day-laborer's toil, are constantly falling, while the stoppage of industries and the enforced idleness of the laborer are the goals to which we are rapidly drifting.

If our government should directly provide by positive enactments for the destruction of the national industries, the depreciation of the property of its citizens and the denial of remunerative labor to its honest toilers, it would well deserve the reprobation of all honest men and the vengeance of a just God. Is it any less criminal, for compassing the same ends by indirect means? By diminishing the volume of full legal tender money to gold alone the identical result is reached, and a nation so unmindful of the welfare of its people cannot expect to prosper. The silver dollar should be made a full legal tender. And there should be no quackery. It would be worse than folly to allow Shylock the unjust and unprecedented privilege of dishonoring the silver dollar, and then attempt to keep it at par with gold by the creation of a special fund or by the sale of bonds. Nor is there need of more metal in the dollar. Give it full legal tender qualities and a dollar of 412½ grains would be at par, just the same as would a dollar of 450 grains. Let Congress but return to the policy of the fathers, give to the silver dollar complete legal-tender qualities, refuse to the money-loaner the disgraceful privilege of dishonoring any of the coined money of the realm, and thenceforward 412½ grains of silver would be worth a dollar in every national mart, and the protective tariff now existing in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

favor of the gold-producer would be forever completely removed. After the four hundred years, what? We have observed, during fifteen centuries in the world's history, a steady decline in intelligence, in the arts and in the freedom and prosperity of the people, commensurate with, and consequent upon, the decline in the volume of money. We have also noticed the quickened activities and steady advance, throughout all nations during the past four hundred years, as the result of a needed supply of money. And now, in the very face of these facts, shall we deny ourselves the use of one of the precious metals, dwarf our industries to the narrow limits of a single gold basis, and thus deliberately turn back the advancing hand on the dial of civilization? If so, then at the end of the four hundred years of prosperity and of advancement in enlightenment and wealth, we will commence a retrogression into the valley of the shadow of gloom such as the world entered upon eighteen centuries ago. With the civilization of Greece and Rome and the sublime truths of the Christian religion carried by warrior and apostle among the nations of Europe at the commencement of the Christian era a general awakening and advance among all peoples might reasonably have been expected. But it was not so. The decrease of the volume of money caused a stagnation of industries, a decline in commerce, an isolation of communities, and a poverty of the masses against which these wholesome influences were comparatively powerless.

A moneyed oligarchy, after four hundred years, has again gained control of the world's supply of gold, and again dominates for its own enrichment the financial policy of the nations. Is there no hope of deliverance from the galling fetters of its imposed thraldom? If not, what of the future? Go among the great masses of the people of this country and read the lesson legible on every hand. The widely-diffused prosperity of former years is no more. The light of hope that heretofore brightened the face of the farmer as he enriched his acres and enlarged his granaries, and the face of the laborer as he added little by little to his accumulation of earnings, has given place to a look of anxiety or despair, as, in the hard and constant struggle for the support of themselves and their families, they are scarcely able to provide the bare necessaries of life and keep the wolf of want from the door.

SYLVESTER PENNOYER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LESSON OF THE "VICTORIA" DISASTER.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM McADOO, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

THE appalling accident which resulted in the loss of H. M. S. "Victoria" and of so many brave men and gallant officers, has called forth many opinions, not only on the immediate causes which led to the catastrophe, but as to the lessons to be learned from it with regard to the construction of modern war vessels. The first question, I take it, that will be asked by the citizens of a country which ranks as a considerable naval power, and which is engaged in building war ships, is: "Does the accident show modern naval construction to be at fault, and will it lead to either a radical change in the make-up of the modern battle-ship, or result in its total abandonment for other types of ships or other modes of offensive or defensive warfare on the water?" To all of this, speaking for myself, I am inclined to reply in the negative.

While the best naval authorities agree that until we have before us the experience of an actual war with great naval powers as participants, the true value of the four factors of modern warfare—the gun, ram, armor and torpedo—must be more or less conjectural, yet there are certain known and demonstrated facts from which, by a consensus of opinion of the most scientific and ablest naval officers the world over, conclusions have been reached, upon the wisdom of which nations have staked and will continue to stake many lives and much money. Upon that which cannot be solved without actual war between equal combatants, the sinking of the "Victoria" casts little or no light. We know the tremendous power of a modern gun which makes those of the past wars seem ridiculous, and before which our old-time stone walled forts would be of as little value as a canvas tent; we know that a 110-ton gun firing a full charge strikes a blow equivalent to 60,000 foot tons, equal to raising the "Victoria" vertically six feet in one second; we know that it carries a projectile with the greatest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

force many miles; we know that special armor of a given thickness forged by specially constructed machinery and prepared in a certain way, possesses extraordinary powers of resistance; we know that armored plates showing a concave surface to a projectile are less likely to be penetrated than those that are flat; we know that a torpedo exploded fairly under the greatest ship will prove destructive, and it did not need this accident to show the terrible power of the blow of the ram. The accident, to my mind, does not either add to or detract from the importance of the ram, nor does it lessen in any way the value of the modern gun, with its long and accurate range, great velocity and flat trajectory of its projectile, its ability to train in any direction and fire heavy bursting charges of high explosives, which upon impact are intended to give the effect of an aerial torpedo. It is, as yet, the first and greatest weapon of offence or defence in modern warfare.

The primary object of the battle-ship is to carry the heaviest of such weapons, and also to resist in the greatest possible degree the impact of the projectiles of the enemy. In addition she combines the ram and the torpedo. In a word, the modern battle-ship is intended to be the best effort of science, experience, learning, invention and discovery to produce the highest development of a fighting machine on the water. The sinking of the "Victoria" in no wise condemns this monstrous product of skill and science as a supreme instrument of naval warfare. Different nations acting on different lines of naval policy, and mindful of the circumstances by which they are surrounded, may prefer not to depend on battle-ships, or, at least, not wholly to depend on them, but if any lesson has been learned from the late accident, which would change the character of naval vessels to be built for such a nation, say, for instance, as Great Britain, it is not known to those who are supposed to be best informed on those subjects.

A ten-thousand-ton ship delivering a cutting blow with her ram while going at a high rate of speed is simply irresistible by anything afloat or being built to float. What such a blow means may be estimated from this statement of a naval expert:

"The 'Camperdown' has a weight of 10,600 tons and was moving at a rate of ten knots per hour, or 16.88 feet per second. This would give an impact of 46,900 foot-tons delivered by the sharp ram of the 'Camperdown.' That is equivalent to the blow that would be struck by a railroad train consisting of six large Pullman cars drawn by the heaviest of locomotives—say one of 120 tons—running at a speed of fifty miles per hour."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is also equivalent to a force which would in one second of time lift the "Victoria" bodily four feet and more. Of course with enormous displacement an unsinkable ship might be built.

I do not mean to enter the field in which professional controversy rages as to the value of vessels depending wholly on the ability to ram an opponent. The recent disaster only illustrates the known destructiveness of the ram. The ram and torpedo are the deadly enemies of the warship, but the problem is, with what certainty, and accuracy, you can bring them in war into actual and deadly contact with a swift moving, powerfully armed, alert and vigilant enemy, provided with every modern safeguard and possessed not only of high speed, but of defensive and offensive power of the highest character, including, among his own weapons, a most formidable ram, every naval vessel now built being especially fitted for the purpose of a ram.

An accidental collision may occur at any time, but in action would a skilful commander, unless his motive or steering power were disabled, or unless his vessel had become enveloped in smoke or hampered by some other improbable and unlooked-for cause, give the enemy a chance to use the ram? The skill in manœuvering of the opposing commanders, the speed of the respective vessels, the facility with which they answer their steering gear are all factors in this problem. As against the greater speed of a vessel largely or wholly dependent for destructiveness on the part of its ram, it should, moreover, I think, be remembered that the all-around, protected and heavily-armed enemy would pour upon his pursuer a rapid and continuous fire from the guns of the main and secondary batteries, to which, if the ram is the principal or only weapon, little or no reply could be made. We can reasonably infer that this fire would be effective when we consider that with high-powered guns of 6, 8, 10 and 12 inch calibre, the angular elevation necessary to obtain ranges up to a nautical mile never exceed one and a half degrees. From these guns the projectiles are shot forth with a velocity so great that their trajectory approximates very closely to the horizontal, and the danger space for any vessel of considerable size would cover an area of about 200 yards in length.

What changes in naval architecture the accident may suggest, as to bulkheads and the means of quickly closing the doors lead-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to them, is a matter for professional consideration. On the whole, we may conclude that the great naval powers will continue to build battle-ships, their faith in them in no wise diminished by the late disaster. Until some effective and reliable means of reaching them, either from above or below the water, and applying to a vulnerable part heavy charges of high explosives has been discovered, vessels of the battle-ship and monitor types will be looked upon as the right arm of national defence, and as the most formidable of offensive opponents. Here in the United States the people rightfully look to the navy as the mainstay of coast defence. Fortifications are, of course, a necessary and proper adjunct, but with our long and exposed sea coast to defend, the heavy armored turret, that carries the greatest guns and moves swiftly and at will from place to place, is necessarily of more importance than a stationary battery on shore. The well-protected warship, moving at full speed, has decided advantages over the stationary fort. Our own great Farragut, even with wooden ships, made short work of successfully passing land batteries.

There are two lessons, however, which it seems to me we can learn with great profit in this country from the late disaster. The first is the necessity for squadron drills, and the practical manœuvring of fleets. There is no amount of theoretical learning which will give the same results as this experience. Many of our ablest naval officers in the United States are very deeply impressed with the lack of practice of our own men in these practical evolutions. It would, in my judgment, be of great value to the country and the service could we have a series of practical manœuvres such as those in which the late Admiral Tryon distinguished himself in the British fleet movements in 1888. That we have not been able to keep up more or less constant practice by a squadron of evolution, is not the fault of the Department. Our navy is small, and is necessarily, for the protection of American interests, scattered all over the world. The demand for ships in distant waters is so great, and the number as yet so few, that we are not able to keep a large squadron in home waters, or mass them in foreign stations. Undoubtedly, however, this will be changed in the near future as new ships are put in commission. At any rate, it is to be hoped that our officers and men in the future will have more frequent opportunity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for fleet drill, as it is the only practical way to acquire great skill and ability to handle ships in time of action, and is, moreover, the surest method of acquiring precision in that most important of things in the Navy, the art of signalling.

This leads to the second and greatest consideration, the importance of the personnel. With all his learning, persistence, skill and experience, with all the secrets he has wrenched from nature and learned from art, man has as yet made no machine superior to himself. He may cabin, confine, and chain the great forces to do his bidding, but the supreme intelligence which directs and controls is after all the master of the situation. Think for a moment of what depends upon the ability and courage of the man who, in battle, stands in a small armored tower, into which the light penetrates from a mere slit between the rim and the roof, through which he must see every movement of his enemy, and who directs every movement of his ship! On his intelligence, learning, experience, skill, courage, and nerve rests the safety of the ship, and the life of the crew, and the final outcome of the conflict. He holds in his hand the great powers which beget life and action in the ship, and at his touch she pours forth her fearfully destructive energies; a single false move, a signal misunderstood, a clouding of his vision, the tremor of his hand, the failure of his heart, a nervous collapse, an error of judgment, the lack of experience, and, above all, a failure to possess a quick and acute intelligence, and the cool courage to act with great promptness, and the contest which may involve a nation's rights, its honor, or the invasion of its territory, or the spoliation and humiliation of its people, is lost beyond retrieve. The best powers of invention, the persistent study of science, can beget no substitute for the human intelligence, which, in battle, is to control and direct the movements of these monster fighting-machines on the water. In the day of trial that nation will be most fortunate whose officers possess, in a large degree, the best qualities of mind and body, and a well-balanced combination of learning and experience, to which should be added the greatest possible devotion to the flag, begetting the highest blending of moral and physical courage.

The days when hostile cutlasses gleamed over the bulwarks of old-time frigates and officers cheered the men to repel boarders has passed away, but the all-important necessity for able and gal-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lant officers and brave and efficient men to command and fight our ships is as great, if not greater, than ever. We have now in the United States reached a stage in the material building up of our navy when we may well turn our attention to the consideration of perfecting the welfare and high efficiency of the personnel. And here let me recall the words of Farragut who urged the "great advantage" of obtaining "command young." Most of the commanding officers of our civil war were men under thirty. The age has been gradually increased until now officers arriving at command rank are forty-seven, forty-eight or forty-nine years of age. When the captain is now more than ever the soul of the ship how necessary that he should possess those qualities which generally can only come by long fixed habit of command. One thing I am proud to say, that if the day of trial comes to us as a nation the American people can rest secure in the confidence that nowhere in the world is there a body of naval officers and men more devoted to their profession, better educated in the art of war, more faithful to their flag, prouder of their country, and possessed of more courage and ability than the officers and men of the United States Navy, and saying this I am withholding no just tribute to the exhibition of splendid discipline and cool bravery on the part of the gallant officers and seamen who went down with the ill-fated "Victoria."

WILLIAM MCADOO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROHIBITION IN ENGLAND.

BY SIR WILFRID LAWSON, M. P.

IT HAS been suggested to me that a short account of what has been done, what is being done, and what it is hoped may be done, by those who on this side of the Atlantic are striving to overturn the liquor traffic, would be of interest to the numerous readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. I shall take pleasure, as president of the "United-Kingdom Alliance to Procure the Total and Immediate Legislative Suppression of the Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors as Beverages," in endeavoring to give such an account. But I wish it to be understood that, for the accuracy of the facts stated and for the value of the opinions expressed, I take the sole individual responsibility.

I need not waste many words in describing the ravages which are wrought by drink. From the days when "Noah planted a vineyard and drank of the wine, and was drunken," until the present time, unvarying experience has proved the truth of the refrain of one of our English temperance melodies, "Where there's drink there's danger." In the words of Lord Randolph Churchill, "each generation becomes more and more alcoholized, more fatally liable to crime, poverty, and disease."

This was the truth which was firmly impressed on the minds of those social reformers who, in the year 1853, formed that "Alliance" which I have already mentioned. It is not now, nor has it ever been, either a partisan, a denominational, or a purely total-abstinence organization. The words used by the Provisional Committee, who took the first steps for its formation, have always seemed to me to be most interesting and instructive. They said: "Our trust is that it will never be compressed to a mere teetotal effort,—never be warped by any sectarian bias, nor marred by any political partisanship. Our earnest desire is that its basis may be firmly laid and faithfully maintained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on grounds as broad and catholic as principle and patriotism will admit of, and we pray that all its aims and operations may be conceived and conducted in a devoted spirit of the conscientious discharge of duty to God and to humanity." "Signed on behalf of the Provisional Committee, this first day of June, 1853. William Harvey, Nathaniel Card, Samuel Pope, and Thomas H. Barker, Chairman and Secretaries."

These good and clear-headed men saw plainly enough that the admirable temperance and teetotal organizations—vast as was the good they had done in the past—were almost fatally blocked in their onward career, so long as the legalized facilities for the sale of drink were spread broadcast among the people. They perceived that, as the law sanctioned these mischievous temptations, it was only by an alteration in the law that the evil could be removed; and they perceived also that the only way to obtain the desired alteration in the law was by enlightening and educating public opinion up to the pitch at which it should imperatively demand from the Legislature the required reform. At the first meeting of the General Council, held in Manchester in October, 1853, when the society was publicly inaugurated, the following declaration was unanimously adopted as a basis for the agitation and as indicating the character and scope of the movement:

"1. That it is neither right nor politic for the State to afford legal protection and sanction to any traffic or system that tends to increase crime, to waste the national resources, to corrupt the social habits, and to destroy the health and lives of the people.

"2. That the traffic in intoxicating liquors, as common beverages, is inimical to the true interests of individuals, and destructive to the order and welfare of society, and ought, therefore, to be prohibited.

"3. That the history and results of all past legislation in regard to the liquor traffic abundantly prove that it is impossible satisfactorily to limit or regulate a system so essentially mischievious in its tendencies.

"4. That no considerations of private gain or public revenue can justify the upholding of a system so utterly wrong in principle, suicidal in policy, and disastrous in results, as the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

"5. That the legislative prohibition of the liquor traffic is perfectly compatible with rational liberty and with all the claims of justice and legitimate commerce.

"6. That the legislative suppression of the liquor traffic would be highly conducive to the development of a progressive civilization.

"7. That, rising above class, sectarian, or party considerations, all good citizens should combine to procure an enactment prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages, as affording most efficient aid in removing the appalling evil of intemperance."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sir Walter C. Trevelyan, Bart., was the first president of the Alliance, and soon after its formation he astonished the political world by declaring at a great party dinner: "I am also happy to announce that in that important town (Manchester), where originated the celebrated and mighty league which ended with the abolition of the Corn Laws, there is now organizing another mighty league, which will, I trust, be as victorious as its predecessor, and succeed in removing from our dear fatherland a much greater curse."

The Alliance, of course, at once encountered all the hatred, opposition, and ridicule which in this world are liberally bestowed on movements designed to do any good. But multitudes of the most earnest and successful workers in the Temperance Reformation saw that it filled the very place which it was necessary should be filled if that reformation was to be successful. Father Mathew, especially, hailed its formation with rapture.

But the legalized drink-shops remained, and in some districts were increased in number; and it might be said that the last state of Ireland—as regards drinking—was nearly as bad as its first. It was long before the Alliance obtained any support from the great ones of the earth. The nobility, clergy, and gentry, as a rule, disliked and despised it, and the nobility, clergy, and gentry form a mighty power in this Old World of ours.

The "statesmen," like statesmen everywhere else, watching the "jumping cat," thought they perceived that the liquor-selling interest was stronger than the opponents of that interest, and acted accordingly; while the liquor sellers themselves, their dependents, their dupes, and their organs in the press, could not find words sufficiently strong to express their indignation and their fury against those who even remotely interfered with "the hope of their gains." "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," cried the makers of silver shrines; and "Great is Bacchus of the Beer-shops," shouted the makers of strong drinks, and so loudly that for a time they drowned the still small voice of reason.

Lord Randolph Churchill, whom I have already quoted, has declared his belief that "two-thirds of the members of the present House of Commons are inspired by a terror of the organization of the alcoholic liquor trade, wholesale and retail." If this be the case in a House of Commons elected by a democratic electorate, it may be imagined what the state of things was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than twenty-five years ago, when first a prohibitory measure was formally proposed in Parliament. It was simply a measure providing that licensing authorities should not be allowed to license places for the sale of drink in localities where the population should have definitely, and by decisive majorities, expressed a wish to be free from such licensed houses. It was called the "Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill," as it simply gave permission to the public to protect itself from the drink-sellers. The traders saw in the measure "the thin edge of the wedge," and resisted it accordingly. The philosophers invented the phrase, "You can't make people sober by act of Parliament" (which, of course, really condemned all legislation specially devoted to alcoholic drinks); and the statesmen were disgusted at the simplicity of the measure.

Whenever the bill came before the House, these statesmen used to take up much time in discussing and censuring its details and machinery. At last it was decided by some friend of prohibition that it would be well to move a resolution simply affirming the principle of the above measure, leaving the details to be filled in after the principle had been affirmed. This plan had a certain amount of success, and on three occasions, by increasing majorities, a resolution affirming the right of localities to the power of protecting themselves from the liquor traffic was affirmed by the House of Commons. The last resolution of the three was carried on April 27, 1883, and runs as follows:

"That the interests of the nation urgently require some efficient measure of legislation, by which, in accordance with the resolution already passed and re-affirmed by this House, a legal power of restraining the issue and renewal of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors may be placed in the hands of the persons most interested and affected, namely, the inhabi tants themselves."

This resolution was passed by 264 against 177, including tellers and pairs; and since its adoption we have had five different governments, including the one then in office, most of whose members supported the resolution, yet nothing has been done to carry it into effect. The Prohibition party out of doors have been urgent that action should be taken, but something or other has always been found, or been invented, to block the way. Surely it is not going too far to describe this delay as both discreditable and deplorable.

The reader will now, I hope, understand how matters stand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with us. The principle of optional local self-protection from the liquor traffic is admitted by Parliament, but Parliament has not yet been induced to give that principle legislative effect. And so the drink traffic with all its accompanying horrors goes on from year to year, filling our gaols, workhouses and asylums, entailing greater burdens on the sober and industrious portion of the community, and unchecked, except by the variable, uncertain, and capricious exercise of the authority which is placed in the hands of our magistrates, a body who, as a whole, are much more in sympathy with the makers and sellers of drink than with the victims of the dreadful business.

When one thinks of these victims, he is sometimes inclined to say, "No man careth for their souls," or bodies either. All that the unfortunates are considered fit for by the powers that be is to swell the national revenue derived from the sale of alcohol—which is, according to one of our greatest modern English doctors, a "most deleterious poison." It is almost astounding that this revenue, after more than half a century of temperance teaching and preaching, after the attainment also of all kinds of educational, sanitary, and religious reforms—which we have so often been told would stop excessive drinking,—it is, I say, almost astounding to find this revenue still of the enormous magnitude in which it has been revealed by late financial statements. Not long ago a Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to be himself appalled at the figures which he had to produce to the House of Commons. He said that the receipts from the consumption of alcohol had increased, as compared with the preceding year, by £1,800,000. After expatiating for some time on this amazing and, as he seemed really to feel, most regrettable fact, he came to the conclusion that "something must be done. Thus, one of our ablest public men, when once he began to look this business in the face, saw that legislation could do nothing to promote temperance except by diminishing the legalized temptations to drinking.

I have already indicated that this matter of licensing is in our country—with but trifling exceptions—in the hands of the magistracy, a body not appointed by any popular election, but selected by the Lord Chancellor mainly on account of birth, wealth, or social position. It is because they have neglected to protect the public by withholding drink-licenses that these frightful evils, which horrified the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred to,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have grown up amongst us. It seemed, then, that the only way of meeting the difficulty would be to intrust this "veto" power to stronger, or, in other words, more popular bodies. Accordingly, the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to give to our County Councils, which, roughly speaking, are our local parliaments, the power of ridding their neighborhoods of such drink-shops as they thought fit to remove. It is probable that many County Councils would have eagerly availed themselves of this power in order to benefit and purify these neighborhoods. But here comes in perhaps the most extraordinary proposition which has been made to the House of Commons in modern times. The Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed that some hundreds of thousands of pounds should be taken annually from the taxes of the country and handed over to these County Councils in order that they might pay "compensation"—as he called it in his speech—to those persons who were pecuniarily interested in the liquor shops to be disestablished.

It was admitted that these places were public evils—otherwise there would have been no proposition to get rid of them; it was a part of the law of the land that they held their licenses only for the space of one year, liable to have those licenses withheld when that time had elapsed, at the option of the magistrates, whose duty is supposed to be to act for the public protection. It was known that those interested in these places had made money by them, for no one would persistently carry on a losing business; and yet, after all this, the Chancellor coolly proposed that these men—many of whom had amassed fabulous wealth through the monopoly of the sale of drink—should likewise be enriched by public money when they were compelled to give up selling drink. Whatever position they were in, the public was to pay them. The great liquor trade was one of the main supports of a previous government, and the determination of the latter to give the brewers, who are the principal owners of public-house property, a new parliamentary title and increased value to that property looked very much like the outcome of that gratitude which, no doubt, the government felt to the brewers, and which has also been defined as a "lively sense of favors to come."

The brewers were delighted. They at once saw that so soon as public money had been given for the non-renewal of a single license—which ought to have been withheld by the licensing au-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thority—from that moment the value of licensed property would be indefinitely augmented. But the friends of national sobriety saw it also. They saw it, and they were determined that what Mr. Caine aptly called this great "financial barrier" should not be erected in defence of what one of our public men not long since called this "desolating trade."

So the fight began in real earnest. The government tried hard to popularize their measure by saying—what was perfectly true—that, if carried, it would lead to a certain diminution in the number of public houses. But very few temperance men were influenced by this argument, since they saw clearly that the "financial barrier" which I have mentioned would in the end be a far greater help to the liquor trade than would the purchasing of a few licenses by the County Councils be a damage to it.

One of the largest outdoor demonstrations which ever gathered together assembled in Hyde Park to denounce the compensation scheme. The brewers replied by a monster petition signed by hundreds of thousands of persons, which was presented to the House of Commons with great pomp and ceremony. The ministers of the Crown kept on declaring that their measure was a temperance measure. Mr. Gladstone, Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. Fowler, Sir George Trevelyan, and other leading men of the Liberal party, with vigor and eloquence drove home the reply that the "endowment of public houses" with public money could not possibly be a temperance measure.

The Church of England Temperance Society—alone amid the great temperance societies—looked with some amount of favor on the government scheme; but, on the other hand, all the other temperance organizations were, so to speak, furiously opposed to it, and in their opposition were cordially supported by almost all the religious denominations in the country, who had never on any occasion been so thoroughly welded together as they now were in resisting this scheme for the endowment of the greatest foe to religion and morality which the world has ever seen.

In the House of Commons itself the scene was even more striking. The government—the strongest which we have known for many a day—being re-enforced by a strong contingent of their former opponents, who are now more conservative than the Conservatives, continually vowed and protested that they meant to carry their bill at all hazards—thereby echoing the shouts of de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fiance which it was ordered should be uttered every morning by the Conservative press. All the great measures of the session were postponed for the sake of gratifying the brewers by the passing of this bill. All amendments were rejected. The rank and file of the party were daily summoned to the House to assist in forcing it through. But here the difficulty began. "You can call spirits from the vasty deep, but will they come?" You can send out "whips" for members to come down to the House to vote for government measures, but will they come down when they suspect public opinion is against them? No, they won't, and so the government found out. Gradually, the majorities of that strong administration melted away, growing small by degrees and beautifully less, until on the first clause of the bill they only secured a majority of four. This virtually sounded the knell of the measure, and, though the government struggled doggedly on till the last, the compensation scheme had to be abandoned ultimately, after it had been for about two months before the country, causing during these two months more excitement and indignation than it had seemed possible that any legislative proposition could have produced in so short a space of time.

The great drink question, then, stands thus on this side of the Atlantic: There is a virtual unanimity among the statesmen of all parties that the places licensed for the sale of drink are too numerous. The Conservative statesmen, who make this avowal, also declare that, as they have failed in providing for their diminution by allotting public money for the benefit of those houses which may be dis-established, nothing more is likely to be done by politicians to promote temperance "for the next twenty years." The Liberal statesmen who formerly succeeded in their resistance to the Conservative scheme above mentioned, it must be assumed, have some plan ready for the reduction in the number of drinking houses, inasmuch as they have joined with the Tory statesmen in denouncing the superabundance of such places. The Prohibition party, meanwhile, sticks to its simple, straightforward demand, that it should be placed in the "option" of dwellers in specified localities to protect themselves. The Prohibitionists only ask for what are called, in reference to Africa, "uncontaminated zones," that is, districts without liquor shops, where local public opinion clearly demands that such shall be the case.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not long ago Parliament, for the first time in our political history, gave a majority in favor of Sunday closing—for England. It also, by an overwhelming majority carried the second reading of a bill designed to curtail the sale of liquor in Ireland on Sundays generally, instead of with exceptions, which is now the law, and also to curtail its sale considerably on Saturdays. But neither of these measures has been carried through and inscribed on the statute book, because the government of the day declined to give the time or any of the assistance necessary for carrying the required stages through the House.

But the conflict and the result which I have described—the overthrow of the compensation scheme—is full of hope for the future. It was the voice of the people—the masses—the multitude—which really overthrew that great iniquity. When once they are as united and determined in their attack on the common enemy—Drink—as they have now been in resisting his assault upon them, his final overthrow is certain.

To spread the light, to promote union, and to perfect its own organization, is now the object and the duty of the Prohibition party. In that duty, it is my hope and my belief that they will not be found wanting, but that they will go on until they obtain their long-sought-for triumph over the Liquor Power. That triumph, when attained, will be indeed a great and glorious one, for the Liquor Traffic is by far the deadliest remaining obstacle to the complete success of that Temperance Reformation which Mr. Cobden has truly declared to lie at the foundation of every social and political reform.

WILFRID LAWSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DISEASE AND DEATH ON THE STAGE.

BY CYRUS EDSON, M. D., HEALTH COMMISSIONER OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

THE climax of many plays is the death, in one shape or another, of the heroine, or, sometimes, but more rarely, of the hero. In other dramas sickness or injury of one kind or another plays an important part in the action or even in the plot of the piece. These ills of humanity are by no means confined to melodramas, although a melodrama without a death or deaths would be somewhat strange. In tragedy, death is the culmination of the deception practised on Othello, of the madness of Lear, or of the mistaken patriotism of Brutus. In Webster's most gloomy of plays, *The Duchess of Malfi*, death comes to the heroine as a release from the horrors with which her enemies have surrounded her. Death, too, is the long-looked-for friend of Lady Dedlock, and it throws its mantle of charity over the sins and sorrows of Camille. To the actor and actress, then, there comes a necessity for the study of death and its forerunner, disease.

Perhaps the most common mistake of the lay mind is the association of the dramatic with the conception of death. Nothing is more common than to hear from the pulpit pictures in words of excitement, of alarm, of terror, of the death-beds of those who have not lived religious lives, yet, as a rule, if these pictures are supposed to be those of the unfortunates at the moment of death, they are utterly false. In point of fact, ninety-nine of every hundred human beings are unconscious for several hours before death comes to them; all the majesty of intellect, the tender beauty of thought or sympathy or charity, the very love for those for whom love has filled all waking thoughts, disappear. As a little baby just born into the world is but a little animal, so the sage, the philosopher, the hero or the statesman, he whose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thoughts or deeds have writ themselves large in the history of the world, become but dying animals at the last. A merciful unconsciousness sets in as the mysterious force we call life slowly takes leave of its last citadel, the heart, and what is has become what was. This is death.

It is apparent that such a death as this would not serve the purposes of the playwright. On the stage, where action is the primary demand in the climax of the play, death must be made dramatic. While this is possible, the various causes which produce what I may call a dramatic form of death vary greatly with the cause of the death itself, and, judging from what I have personally seen or from that which I have read, there are many actors and actresses who do not understand this. Or, if they do, they have failed to learn what are the physical symptoms, the movements of the body or parts of it, that invariably follow certain causes of death. To illustrate my meaning, I will take as an example death when caused by a bullet through the heart.

I am not unmindful of the fact that actors or actresses must, to a certain extent, be conventional in their work. That is, they must present to their audiences that action which those audiences have been accustomed to associate with certain causes. A familiar illustration which presents itself is the first series of photographs taken of a horse galloping, by Muybridge of San Francisco. We had all been accustomed to the conventional galloping horse, and when the camera revealed to us the real movements they came as a kind of shock. It was almost impossible to believe that a horse could assume such strange positions. I remember one, particularly, in which the animal appeared standing on one fore leg, the other three being in the air. Since then our artists have painted and drawn horses, while in rapid motion, in their real attitudes—as, for example, in the pictures of Frederick Remington—and our eyes have become accustomed to these positions. But those of us who remember the pictures taken by Muybridge will remember also the feeling of incredulity with which we looked at them. Precisely the rules implied here hold good of the stage. An actress is supposed to swallow poison in the form of arsenic. The first real effect of this would be to cause in the person taking it the most violent colic imaginable, and it would be physically correct were the actress to roll about on the stage pressing her hands on her stomach. Yet it is apparent that no audi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence would tolerate such action on her part, and no one in that audience, unless it were a physician or toxicologist, would accept the action as holding the mirror up to nature. For all that, it would not only be right but anything else would be ridiculous and absurd.

To return to the death caused by a bullet through the heart. The causes of death are cutting the heart, letting the blood into the lung cavity, which is also cut into, and stopping the circulation. When the blood floods the lung cavity there would be an instinctive effort to throw it out, and the sufferer might cough it up. This is the only thing connected with the cause of death which could by any possible means be represented on the stage. But this would not be in the least dramatic; it would be, if faithfully carried out, very disgusting. There would be a bubbling kind of cough, an appearance of great distress and finally a hemorrhage from the mouth. The causes of death in this case, therefore, cannot be represented. I suppose that all of my readers understand it is impossible to suddenly disturb any group of nerves without producing what are called reflex (when so produced reflex may be translated involuntary or automatic) actions in more or less of the other nerves. If you smash your finger you will generally jump; the disturbance of the nerves of the finger produces involuntary action (we call this reflex) of the nerves of the legs, through the spinal cord and, as the nerves govern and move the muscles, the jump follows.

Now, the movement of the heart, its beating, which draws in and squeezes out the blood, and thus causes the circulation of that fluid through the arteries and veins, is controlled and carried on by nerves which are not subject to our will. No man on this earth can, by any exercise of his will, even lessen the beating of his heart. It is, perhaps, because the nerves of the heart carry on this work automatically that any disturbance of them has the greatest possible effect on all other nerves of the body. The automatic or reflex action following this disturbance is general, and the effects of the shock are most noted. When, then, an actor or an actress simulates death from a bullet through the heart, he or she simulates not the symptoms of the death itself, but those of the reflex action caused by the disturbance of the nerves. And of these there are enough to warrant any amount of action.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The majority of people who have been shot through the heart have jumped high in the air, waved or tossed the arms, turned partly around and fallen. This act is the result of a simultaneous movement of every muscle in the body, and, of course, in it the muscles of greatest strength, those of the thighs, have directed the general result. In the case of Harry Larkyns, shot through the heart by Muybridge, the photographer, in California in 1874, the victim ran through a short hall way and open door, and dropped under a tree in the back yard. These short bursts of speed are not uncommon. Harold Strange, a soldier in Meade's army at Gettysburg, was shot through the heart at the Bloody Angle. He leaped the stone wall, and ran towards the Confederate line, falling just as he reached it. A man shot through the heart by Juaquin Murietta, the bandit, turned two somersaults and fell. Violent, intense action, in a blind, unreasoning fashion, results from the shock when a person is shot through the heart.

It is common enough to see Othello fall down as he reads the line

"and smote him, thus!"

The Moor is supposed to have stabbed himself to the heart, but, from a physician's standpoint, the fall is absurd. The same objection is pertinent when Brutus kills himself. In each case the death is meant to be dignified; nor am I perfectly certain that audiences would tolerate anything else. In point of fact, however, you can understand, from what I have already written, that it would be impossible for any man to control the reflex action of the other nerves when those of the heart are so suddenly disturbed, and with this would come the involuntary movement of all the muscles, the greater again dominating the action. A man stabbed to the heart would act in very much the same way as one shot, nor would it be possible for him to prevent it. We all have had hiccough, and we all know the vexatious way in which this annoying involuntary spasm of the muscles defies the will power; yet a man could far more easily control this than he could the reflex action of the nerves producing involuntary movements of the muscles which would follow with the shock produced by sudden disturbance of the nerves of the heart.

From King Lear to that maniac wife of Rochester in *Jane Eyre*, whose solitary shriek before the audience, as she rushes across the stage in her only appearance has always seemed to me

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supremely ridiculous, the range of madness in the drama is very wide. In that most horrible of all plays, Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*, a number of the insane appear, when the drama is produced as it was written—something never done nowadays. I am not quite prepared to say that madness should never be represented behind the footlights, but I confess to a feeling that the less we see of it the better. It seems to me the affliction of the demented is so awful that it should almost be held sacred. I feel about it as a devout Catholic would feel were it proposed to have mass in the playhouse, or as many good people felt when the scheme was on foot to produce the "Passion Play" in New York.

As a matter of fact, madness, insanity, dementia in any form, is not in itself dramatic. The acts of the insane, of course, may be; as, for example, when a person is supposed to have homicidal mania and kills another. In this case there is an added horror in the act when we reflect that the murderer is wholly irresponsible. The same horror inheres in it as that which Poe made such use of in his *Murders in the Rue Morgue*. It is the thought that, awful as the crime is, it is the crime of a brute, of an animal that does not realize what it is doing. While this is all true, the act itself gathers its dramatic force far more from the fact that life is taken, that death, which we all instinctively hate, comes to the victim before his or her time. We must be careful to duly separate the dramatic from the horrible; the first results from the act apart from anything else, the second from the madness which is the irrational, unreasoning cause.

As I have said, there is nothing dramatic in madness. The insane, apart from the particular belief or fixed idea which marks their insanity, are very much like other people. Were any one to go to Bloomingdale or to the farm for the insane on Long Island, he would find it difficult to believe at first that those about him were not in all respects like other people. It is this fact which is at the base of the many stories we see in the daily press of people who are kept in asylums without cause. The popular idea of an insane person—an unfortunate, who crouches in a corner of a room, and there gibbers and mows at all—is nowadays utterly without foundation. Undoubtedly in those times now long gone by, when the insane were treated as criminals, the horrible picture of the madhouse, as drawn by Hogarth, was justified; but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to-day, thanks to the greater knowledge we have and the spread of humanitarian feelings, it would be absurd.

In nothing do the player folk yield more to the popular and conventional ideas of their audience than in their personation of the insane. While this is, I suppose, necessary, it is yet to be sincerely regretted. Madness is a sufficiently awful affliction, and the sorrow of those whose loved ones are suffering is great enough, without having it intensified by misrepresentation. While I cannot say that I think actors and actresses can do anything else, having before them the supreme necessity of making their action dramatic, it is this fact which adds to my dislike to seeing insanity depicted behind the footlights.

Many of the great actors and actresses have sought to study the insane for purposes of their art. The late John McCullough —himself fated to end his days at Bloomingdale, poor fellow!— told a friend of mine once that he had been studying insane patients before producing Lear. He complained, or rather spoke, of the fact that in no way did their actions differ from those of others and of the difficulty he found in getting any hints or lessons from them. In this he was right, for a sane man personating insanity is far more insane than are the mad themselves. In fact, when for any reason a person puts on insanity (a man accused of murder, as was Guiteau, for example), he is almost invariably found out because he overdoes it. But Mr. McCullough told a good story of Forrest which I have never seen in print. It seems that Forrest, before playing the same part, went to an insane asylum near Philadelphia for the same purpose. He watched one of the male patients for some time, during which the man kept saying: "I wonder how long! I wonder how long! I wonder how long!" Finally Forrest interrupted him. "What is it that you wonder how long?" he said. The man turned on him with a laugh. "I wonder how long a d—d fool like you will stand there looking for something he can't see."

Perhaps one of the best known deaths on the stage is that of Camille in Alexandre Dumas's play. Camille is supposed to die of consumption and the death comes from hemorrhage of the lungs. Now, in point of fact, the action of the body following hemorrhage of the lungs has nothing dramatic about it. If the blood vessel which breaks is very large there may be a semi-convulsion resulting from shock. Otherwise, the death comes from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loss of blood that pours from the mouth or from strangulation; that is, the lungs fill with blood, so that the sufferer cannot breathe. But such a death as this would not satisfy the demands of the stage, or what are believed by many persons to be those demands, and we therefore see Camille in strong convulsions. It is the old story of the galloping horse once more.

There are many deaths on the stage in plays when the cause of death is supposed to be heart disease. As a matter of fact, there are a number of diseases of the heart, in the majority of which the person dies because the heart simply stops beating. When this happens a real death is like nothing so much as a faint or syncope, the sufferer merely collapses and the end has come. About such deaths, however, there is nothing dramatic, and actors and actresses, therefore, generally choose to personate that form of heart disease known to physicians as *angina pectoris*. In this disease there is the most intense pain conceivable, and those suffering from it not only manifest the intolerable character of the pain by walking up and down, by moaning or crying, by throwing the arms about and sometimes by beating the chest with the clenched fist, but they often have convulsions in which all parts or limbs of the body are violently distorted. This disease gives any person ample opportunity for action, and as it is always advisable for an actor or actress to study that which he or she is to portray, the following story is worth telling. I should say that, while the story is true, I am quite certain there are very few physicians who would be guilty of the disgraceful part played by this one. An actress in New York, having to personate death by heart disease, went to her physician to get from him some directions. He told her he had a patient who had *angina pectoris* and asked the actress to come to his office on a certain day. When she came he had his patient, a poor woman, there. He ordered the patient to run up stairs as fast as possible, giving some excuse. This the woman did and brought on thereby an attack of the disease. She suffered and depicted the agony of the seizure while the actress watched her carefully, and she nearly died in the attack. It does not palliate the monstrous cruelty of this performance that the actress gave the woman a hundred dollars. The end was served, the actress personated the disease in the play and was very successful. Many of those who will read this story well know the people referred to, and I only regret that a promise, given before I heard it, binds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my pen. I think that physician should be held up to the execration of all good men. I believe the actress, if she knew what was to be done, was ignorant of the possible consequences and wholly failed to realize the hideous cruelty of the affair, but no such excuse may be pleaded for the man who planned it.

Speaking of studying disease, Richard Mansfield, as Baron Chevrial in *A Parisian Romance*, personates the unilateral convulsions (that is, convulsions of one side of the body only) of apoplexy better than I have ever seen symptoms reproduced on the stage. Before he played the part he went to a physician, and learned from him what to do and how to do it. The result was most admirable from the physician's point of view, for the acting of the death was not less perfect than that of the life.

In many plays the characters are supposed to take poison, and the popular belief as to the effects of poisons is as mistaken as it well can be. I have already spoken of the colic that follows swallowing arsenic. It is ordinarily believed that the effect of laudanum, or of opium in any form, is to put a person to sleep. Not only is this untrue of many people, but invariably the first effects of the drug are to enliven and excite the person taking it. When, then, you see the heroine in the dungeon swallow the contents of the bottle of laudanum and at once sink into a profound slumber, you are watching something that never yet took place. The secondary effect of opium, on probably eighty per cent. of human beings, is to put them to sleep, and, as this effect is much more lasting than the first excitement, it has possession of the popular mind.

The convulsions which so often follow the taking of poison on the stage may be produced by a common poison, strychnine. Properly speaking, strychnine does not produce convulsions in which there is a great and rapid movement of the limbs. The muscles of the back and the great flexor muscles of the legs and thighs are contracted into a sort of prolonged rigidity so that the sufferer is bent backward like a bow and often is supported by his head and heels, the body being arched between. Mlle. Croisette, in Paris, when playing in *La Sphynx*, created a great sensation and made a great name for herself. She went to Dr. Charcot, the eminent physician of Paris, and, learning from him the effects of poisons, chose strychnine and had the name inserted in the play. She studied carefully all that books could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tell her, and then procured several dogs and gave them the poison, watching the spasms which followed. She produced such a perfect simulation of the results following the swallowing of strychnine that, not only did the daily press praise her, but one of the medical journals devoted quite a long article to this part of the play and advised medical students to go to the theatre for the purpose of studying the symptoms of poisoning by strychnine. For one Croisette that you will find on the stage, however, you will easily see a hundred victims of poison who simply cause the physician to smile.

If there is anything more funny than the taking of poison on the stage and its results, it is the method used to save the life of those that have swallowed it. The first thing a physician does when called in to a case of poisoning is to make his patient vomit. It is a thousand times easier to get rid of such portions of the fatal dose as may not have been absorbed than it is to neutralize them, and for that reason strong emetics followed by the stomach pump are invariably resorted to. This could not be done, however, on the stage, even in these days of realism, because the audience would be disgusted, and very properly, too. But the antidotes used are very funny. I remember a melodrama which I went to see performed when I was a student—I have forgotten the name, but it had a long run at the Old Bowery Theatre—in which the heroine took arsenic by mistake. Of course she had the convulsions which stageland arsenic brings on—no other variety ever does—and the hero saved her! How? By scraping plaster off the walls and giving it to her in water. It was a noble act on that hero's part, and any hero who could make the alkali of lime neutralize arsenic not only deserved the hand, heart and fortune of the lovely heroine, but a leather medal from the nearest drug store for his knowledge of chemistry. A little time spent on books or with a physician would save authors of plays from asking impossibilities of the people in the cast.

The symptoms, that is, the violent symptoms of disease which, so far as I have been able to observe, are best known to actors and actresses are those of epilepsy. Perhaps because epilepsy is not uncommon, or perhaps because the convulsions which accompany its attacks have become a part of the traditions of the stage, you see either these or actions based on them in nearly every violent attack of illness or in nearly every death on the stage. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is true that, so far as the action of convulsions is concerned, those of epilepsy are among the most dramatic known to medical men. There are the frothing at the mouth, the limbs violently distorted, the sudden and convulsive movements, the rigidity of the body broken up by the most extreme contortions; all these are dramatic. But exactly why the symptoms of epilepsy should have become the conventional symptoms of heart disease, of consumption, of poisoning, of death by violence—in short, of every death on the stage—I do not quite understand. One result of it is the creation in the minds of a theatre-going people, such as we are, of the most strange ideas of death that may be imagined. I spoke in the first part of this article of the misconception existing in the popular mind of the dramatic as associated with death, and in the building up of this misconception the stage has done its part. I do not suppose that it matters very much, for as to all of us soon or late death will come, so it makes little difference what we think about it beforehand. Still, among what Sir Thomas Browne first called "the errors of the vulgar," none are more complete than this.

To the well-regulated mind there is nothing more delightful on the stage than the work of that ancient and honorable body, the supers. It is among them, when the exigencies of the drama demand their deaths, that the most delicious methods of presenting the victory of the "grim conqueror" may be found. When the hero, in big hat, crimson sash, blue shirt and immaculately polished boots, stands with one arm around the heroine and deals death among the ignoble Red Men with his apparently inexhaustible revolver, then it is that one sees high art. The Red Man, in his buckskin shirt and feather head-dress, receives his death wound and wallops—I can find no better word—about the stage just in front of the practicable rocks for the space of five minutes. Even then he is not quite gone, for a convulsive kick at intervals shows the passing of his haughty spirit. When at last death comes to him, the physician goes home pondering to himself how many, many things there are that he does not know.

CYRUS EDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANGLO-SAXON UNION:

A RESPONSE TO MR. CARNEGIE.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D.

The relations of the different portions of the English-speaking race to each other and the common mission of the race, if it has one, are subjects which Americans generally, trained on panegyrical history, have hitherto seen too much through the eye-let hole of an antiquated feud with the memory of a King for whose misdeeds no living man is any more responsible than for the misdeeds of the Pharaohs or Sennacherib. That liberal spirits are now rising to a worthier point of view Mr. Carnegie's article, "A Look Ahead," in a recent number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW was a proof. Anglo-phobia is slowly giving way in American literature to moral breadth and historical justice, though its traditional force is still great, and in the writings of politicians it is apt to be affected, whether it is felt or not, as a tribute to conventional sentiment. Its last and not least strange manifestation is the work of an anglo-phobiac who labors in two bulky volumes to widen and prolong the schism of the race by showing that American institutions are derived, not from the mother country of New England, but from the mother country of New Amsterdam, in which it seems they had been studied by a party of religious peasants, who, during their brief sojourn, shrank, as we are expressly told, from the contagious influence of Dutch society and departed because they feared that it would absorb their children and that their English nationality would be lost.

A common language is in itself a most important bond of union. As few men comparatively read or speak any language but their own, the ideas and sentiments of the race must, so far as they are formed by reading, be cast into the mould of the common literature, in which the character of the mass is sure to prevail. While the American has been nursing ancestral hatred of England he has been undergoing the influence of the English authors upon his table. But all communities of British origin also show a marked and peculiar tendency to parliamentary govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, personal liberty, and freedom of opinion. All have been alike distinguished from most of the other races by their respect for law. If the race has a distinct mission it would seem to be to extend the reign of law. Wherever the British flag advances, in Hindustan, Egypt, or elsewhere, the dominion of law advances with it, and beneath it no Hindoo ryot or Egyptian fellah can be deprived of the smallest article of property without due legal process, or of life or liberty without regular and open trial. France may be making her tri-color, we are making our Great Charter, go round the world. Despite is done not only to the dignity of the race but to its collective duty to humanity when one portion of it helps a race less law-abiding in setting its neck upon another portion.

A moral reunion of the race, with a common pride in its common history and a consciousness of the part which collectively it has played and may yet play in the development of humanity, seems not very far from realization. By the opening prospect and the warm sense of returning goodwill the idea of a still closer connection appears to have been generated in some minds. A vision of this kind floats through Mr. Carnegie's paper. But such a thing as a political or even a diplomatic unity of the English-speaking communities scattered over the globe is surely inconceivable. Supposing such a union possible, what definite object would it have? Where would its centre be? Who would direct its policy? By its irresistible power, we are told, it would impose peace upon the world. Unfortunately, consciousness of irresistible power is more apt to incline to aggression than to the enforcement of peace, while the jealousy which such combination would excite could hardly fail to lead to counter-combination and call the rest of the world to arms. Besides, while there are important elements of unity in the race, there are also important elements of diversity arising from the local admixture in unequal proportions of alien blood, from variety of circumstances attendant on dispersion over two hemispheres, and from the shades of character produced by living under institutions radically, perhaps, the same yet modified in important ways. Mutual privilege in respect to naturalization laws might not be impracticable; otherwise to nothing beyond a moral reunion, it would seem, can we rationally aspire.

To a moral reunion of the English-speaking race, assuming,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as we probably may, that the influence of the Irish vote is transitory, there is apparently but one serious impediment. That impediment is the intrusive presence of Great Britain as a political power in this continent, with the constant irritation and frequent disputes which her presence inevitably breeds. For this the men of the American Revolution have to answer, since, when they expelled the loyalists, they constrained Great Britain to provide the exiles with a new home, and bound her in honor to keep her flag flying over them there.

The question of the relations between Canada and the United States has been brought up for practical discussion not only by the tariff and the McKinley Act but by the movement in favor of Imperial Federation, which aims at finally severing Canada from this continent and incorporating her in a federation, the centre of which is to be a European power. American statesmanship cannot blink the issue. The question whether this continent shall be united or whether it shall be divided, and a power antagonistic to the American Republic shall be formed to the north of it, is surely the one subject of external policy which is of vital importance to the American people. The American people expended, as it is reckoned, eight billions of money and a million of lives to rectify their relations with five millions of whites at the South, though the five millions of whites brought with them four millions of blacks and a problem still defying solution. Will they treat as a matter of indifference the cheap and bloodless rectification of their relations with five millions of whites at the North unencumbered with any fatal appendage? If the South commanded the mouth of the Mississippi, the North commands the mouth of the St. Lawrence.

I have said "a power antagonistic to the American Republic." Where separation is natural it may be friendly; where it is unnatural it is pretty sure to be antagonistic, on the part at least of the smaller power. England and Scotland being in the same island, so that separation was unnatural, there was constant hostility between them, and Scotland was always leaguing herself with England's enemies, until they were united. The connection of Canada as a dependency is morally with that party in England which is distinctively imperialist and unfriendly to American institutions, as was shown by its course at the time of the American civil war. The Toronto *Empire* is the recognized

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organ of the Tory and Imperialist party in Canada, and of the recent utterances of this journal one of its contemporaries says:

> These are days of wild joy about the office of *The Empire*. The daily bulletin that tells of commercial stringency and financial disaster in the United States it rolls as a sweet morsel over its tongue. Each piece of news that tells of distress and business shipwreck across the line is hailed with enthusiasm, and gloatingly enlarged on, and exaggerated with a malicious delight which can be accounted for on no reputable ground that suggests itself to the mind. But, besides this indecent joy over the misfortunes of a neighbor, the editorial columns of the paper for months past have contained an almost daily discharge of venom against the people of the United States. The Columbian Exposition in Chicago has afforded a splendid opportunity for a diurnal outpouring of spleen, petty enough, it is true, but, nevertheless, indicative of the spirit that prompts it.

This, it will be observed, is at a time of perfect outward amity (for the Behring Sea controversy hardly touches eastern Canada), when Mr. Cleveland, whom Canadians regard as a friend, is President and when Canada is looking for tariff concessions at his hands. At the last general election the Conservative party distinctly appealed to anti-American feeling, as Americans failed not to note. They will have noted also that efforts have been made of late to revive old antipathies by celebrating events in the war of 1812, and by decorating the graves of those who fell in the Fenian raid.

Of the Canadians themselves few, probably, believe that things can remain forever as they are. During a residence of more than twenty years in Canada I have seldom met with a Canadian who, if he had thought at all freely on these matters, did not in private avow or betray his conviction that a change must some day come. The perpetual dependence of a free community on one side of the Atlantic upon a community on the other side is an arrangement which, though some may be personally willing to prolong it, few would pronounce reasonable or eternal. It is but the lingering shadow of what once was imperial sway. Its only assignable advantage to the dependency is the military protection of Great Britain, and this is needed only because Canada, as a British dependency, is involved in British quarrels, while, if Great Britain were engaged in a war with maritime powers, it would hardly avert the destruction of Canadian trade. Imperial federation, independence and continental

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

union are the courses among which many, perhaps most, Canadians feel that a choice must presently be made. That the question of their destiny is before the Canadian people no reader of their journals can fail to see. By the Imperial Federationists themselves the subject is pressed on the ground that the supreme moment has come, and that the cable, now worn to the last strand, must be replaced by a fresh cable or the connection will cease.

Imperial Federation as a generous dream is entitled to sympathy and respect, but at present it is an aspiration without form and void. Its advocates conjure us not to ask for a plan, but to cultivate the sentiment, which in the case of Canada means cultivating such feelings as will estrange us from the United States. I have elsewhere endeavored to state the objections to any assignable form of a union, the general object of which has not been stated any more than the means by which it is to be brought about, the structural difficulties of which are enormous, and which runs directly counter to the prevailing tendencies of the age. There has been much outpouring of eloquence in favor of Imperial Federation, with free denunciation of unbelievers, but no practical step has yet been taken towards the realization of the scheme. During all the years when Lord Beaconsfield, the high priest of Imperial aggrandizement, was in power, not only was nothing done by government, but no serious motion was brought forward in Parliament. Lord Salisbury, another strong Imperialist, was approached in vain. He sanctioned a convention, but confined it to questions of postal arrangements and other matters of that kind, which had no more to do with Imperial Federation than they had with the nebular hypothesis. If Imperial Federation meetings are numerously attended in Canadian cities it is largely by protectionists, who are ready to embrace anything that offers itself as a bulwark against American competition, but dread British competition just as much, and would at once fly off if they were asked to consent to free trade between the colonies and Great Britain, which is an essential part of the Federationist idea. By the French Canadians, tenacious of their separate nationality, the name of Imperial Federation is abhorred. Nor does the scheme of a fiscal federation of the Empire, though less ambitious, seem more practicable. The different colonies and dependencies differ from each other so widely in their com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mercial circumstances that there can be little hope of devising a fiscal system which will commend itself to them all.

To independence, I must confess, I was myself at one time inclined. At all events I felt a strong sympathy with the band of young Canadians who, inspired by the achievement of confederation and by the appeals addressed to their patriotism on that occasion, were setting out to make Canada a nation. But the movement found little support, and though it is now being revived in opposition to continental union it seems not to have much strength in itself. In some quarters, probably on the part of its ostensible advocates in Quebec, independence is only a cover for continental union, for which there is a timorous reluctance in face of tradition and conventional sentiment openly to declare. It could hardly be anything but a half-way house. The provinces are too totally wanting in unity, geographical, economical and even ethnological; for the French nationality in Quebec, the forces of the Dominion not being equal to its absorption, gains instead of losing intensity, and is thrusting out the British population from every part of the Province except the commercial quarter of Montreal. There is little inter-provincial trade, except what is forced by a stringent system of protection. Nor is there any barrier, of language or of any other description, to keep the Dominion separate from the mass of population to the south of it, with which its own population is rapidly commingling, with which its commerce and its banks are wound up, with which it is connected by an identical railway system, which contains its winter ports, from which it receives its periodical literature, with which it has churches, brotherhoods, and societies of all kinds in common, and to which it is increasingly attracted by social influences and family ties. If there were anything special to be conserved in Canada, a Canadian or a social philosopher might, for the sake of it, be willing to bear the expense of a separate government and to face the attendant liabilities. But there is nothing at all events for which the elastic liberality of the Federal system would not leave free scope.

That the best relation between the two sections of the race on this continent and the only one on which they can permanently rest is that of equal and honorable union is the conviction to which I have been led not without consideration of the arguments on the other side, or even, as I have said, without at one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time inclining to a different view. That it is the natural relation, and that separation is artificial, a glance at the map will show. Suppose those four blocks ef territory, advancing separately from the habitable continent into the region of ice and snow, had never been divorced from the main mass, would anybody dream of divorcing them now? Would he not be deemed a lunatic who should propose it? The severance was the work of pure historical accident and of a quarrel as devoid of any permanent significance as a quarrel can be. Can we imagine that it is destined to endure forever?

The advantages of reunion to both parties are manifest and are hardly denied by those who, on what they think higher grounds, oppose the measure. It would exclude war from North America and dedicate the whole continent securely to peaceful industry and progress. It would remove all internal customs lines and impediments to trade. It would make the St. Lawrence, the fisheries, the sealing grounds, and all the privileges which are now the subject of perpetual disputes, the undisputed heritage of all. It would open the whole field, including Manitoba and the Canadian Northwest, to the free flow of population. It would call forth the mineral wealth, now dormant, of the North by admitting Canadian capital and enterprise to a region which they are now prevented from freely entering by mistrust of a foreign jurisdiction. The commercial benefits which it would confer on Canada by putting an end to the commercial atrophy necessarily attendant on her present state of isolation need not be rehearsed. Not only is the home market of Canada small as a whole, but it is divided into four with wide spaces, involving heavy freights, between them. Commercially the position of Ontario and Quebec is what that of two not very wealthy American States if taken out of the Union would be. The existing States of the Union on the other hand would gain commercially by the accession of Canadian States, just as they have gained by the admission of any other new States, say of Minnesota or Dakota. Those who protest against giving a market of sixty-five millions for a market of five millions fall into the singular fallacy of imagining that an addition is a subtraction when the less is added to the greater.

Another advantage of union which presents itself strongly at the present moment is the power which it would afford of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dealing uniformly with continental problems. Of those problems the most urgent is immigration. We need not here discuss the Chinese question. It is sufficient that, as nobody will deny, the question whether the Pacific coast of this continent shall be opened, with a prospect of its being at last socially ceded, to a race radically, perhaps unalterably, alien to our civilization, is on any hypothesis one of the most vital kind. But it cannot be solved, nor can an immigration of Chinese or of any other alien nationality be effectually controlled unless the whole continent is brought under one jurisdiction. At present, when the front door is closed by Congressional legislation, a back door is opened in Canada, and the practical result of American interdiction is that the Canadian Government raises a small revenue by the transmission of Chinese through its territory into the United States.

It is more to the purpose to estimate the objections to union than to proclaim the advantages of its accomplishment. When the subject is mentioned to Americans two bugbears present themselves. One of these is the Roman Catholic population of French Canada, which, it is supposed, would from its religious character and its reactionary tendencies form a dangerous element in the Republic. The continent would be fortunate if it were not likely to receive any worse addition to its inhabitants than the French of Quebec. They are backward, it is true, in education, in intelligence, and in industrial activity, because they have been kept back by the influences, ecclesiastical and social, to which they are subjected in their state of isolation. But they are good people, kindly by nature, courteous, eminently domestic like the country people of France, frugal and generally moral, their clergy having, to do it justice, taken great care of their morality. Politically, they have been the victims of systematic corruption which has not failed to affect their character. But they are free from any tendency to political conspiracy or cabal. They are also free from the tendency to industrial wars, and make, it appears, good and tractable workmen in the factories of New England. Though the forces of Canada are inadequate to the assimilation of the French, by the forces of the United Continent they would probably be assimilated, for all essential purposes, not less easily than the French of Louisiana; more easily, perhaps, since they are closer to the centre of influence, and are not estranged by any peculiar institution like slavery. Certain,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however, it is, that the Roman Catholic French of Quebec are not to be kept out of the United States by keeping them out of the Union. Into the Northeastern States they are annually pouring, and the volume of immigration will increase with the continuance of the fiscal isolation, the pressure of which is specially felt by Quebec, as her natural products are unfit for exportation to Europe. In fact, the present arrangement is the worst for the United States that could be devised, since separation keeps the people of Quebec under the dreaded influences, and, when they have been trained under those influences, drives them into the United States. Union would bring the nest from which the swarm goes forth under the liberalizing influences of the Republic. If we turn from French Canada to the Canadian Northwest we find that there, while the natural inflow of American immigration is barred by the political line, the region is being artificially filled with Mennonites, Icelanders, Roman Catholic crofters from Skye, colonies from the London slums, and other elements which are alien to American civilization, but which, if manifest destiny ever prevails, must be incorporated in the American commonwealth. An American will, perhaps, be pleased when he reads in Canadian papers that there is a perpetual exodus into the United States of the flower of Canadian youth, but his satisfaction might be diminished if he knew the sort of immigration from Europe by which the void is partly filled, and which some day may be incorporated in the United States.

The second bugbear is the Canadian vote, which, it is imagined, would be solid, and would upset the balance of the American party system. This fear is baseless. As has been already said there is among the provinces no natural unity, geographical, commercial, or ethnological. They have been held together and made to form the basis for the Ottawa government by the continual exertion of government influence. Each of them, when it was in the Union, would be drawn to the States which it would adjoin and with which it would be identified in commercial interest. A political conspiracy between British and French Canada, or between Ontario and those maritime provinces which French Canada cuts off from it, would be the most unlikely thing in the world. Whether the majority of Canadians would go into the Republican or Democratic party only astrology can undertake to foretell. That a recollection of their separate existence with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their local traditions and feeling would dispose the Canadians, or at least the British part of them, to cherish local self-government and repel the encroachments of central power is most probable. Little else can be predicted. Solid Canadian vote, Americans may be assured, there will be none.

That extension of territory should be rather dreaded than desired is a proof of the wisdom and morality of the American people. But the extension in this case would be not only peaceful but natural. It would be the manifest dictate of nature. The recent admission of six new States is not felt to have been attended with the slightest fear of disruption. No such danger can there ever be till there is formed a line of cleavage, such as there was between the Slave States and the Free; and when the tariff question has once been settled there will remain no prospect of anything of the kind. The elasticity of the federal system renders it capable of indefinite extension so long as geographical unity is maintained, and federal government, while it observes its proper limits, will be known only as the source of benefits and immunities against which nobody is likely to rebel. If three hundred millions of Chinese can live under one government so surely can a hundred millions of Anglo-Saxons.

Some Americans, feeling that American democracy is after all not the last word in politics, think two experiments better than one. That they should prefer political instruction to territorial aggrandizement or commercial gain shows that they are profoundly wise. But there is not in reality a double experiment. The two democracies, though one has a vice-regal coronet on its head, are in all essential respects identical. There is no material difference in the suffrage. Organized party is the real power under both constitutions, and its machinery and modes of action in both cases are the same. So is the relation between political morality and that of common life. The distinctive part of the Canadian arrangement is the adoption of the British system of cabinet government, with a legislature subject to dissolution at the pleasure of the Prime Minister, who advises, and if his advice were not taken, would depose the representative of the Crown. But British institutions, especially when they rest not on written laws but on traditional understandings, require British statesmen for their operation. Otherwise the result is a disappointment, like that of my lord who bought the puppet show without the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

showman. Of the dependence of the executive on the vote of the legislature the practical result is a constant effort on the part of the executive to corrupt the legislature and the constituencies by which it is elected. Municipal government and its liabilities are the same on both sides of the line. So far as political affinity is concerned Canada would fall at once with the greatest ease into the party system of the United States. Hardly a wire or a wire-puller need be disturbed.

A greater difficulty is, perhaps, presented by the difference between the two banking systems of the two countries and the relation of the American system to government securities. The day will, perhaps, come when governments will understand that their duty is simply to stamp the coin, or to provide any special safeguards in the case of banks of issue which circulation may require, and that they have no more business to interfere with the money trade or to appropriate a share of its profits than they have to interfere with the dry-goods trade or to dip their hands into the till of the dry-goods firm.

The change of flag again is a point which, whenever negotiations for reunion are set on foot will call for considerate treatment. Strong feeling, however, on this subject, like the anti-unionist sentiment generally, has its chief seats in Toronto and one or two other cities where the flag is daily seen and of late has been industriously displayed. In the rural districts the flag is not often seen. The shock caused by a change has, perhaps, been somewhat overstated. The English, Scotch, and Irish flags underwent great changes at the unions, and half a dozen of the great European powers at least, besides France, have, within the last century, changed their flags, adopting in place of their ancient standards mostly varieties of the tricolor. The Canadians, nearly a million in number, who are now south of the line, have all come under the Stars and Stripes apparently with little compunction or suffering.

That an inclination towards union with the rest of their continent is spreading, in rural Canada especially, seems to me a fact, which anxious and vehement denial only confirms. That the sentiment is commercial rather than political and arises from a desire of the American market rather than of American institutions is true. But political change is seldom sought for itself or without the belief that it will bring some material benefit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or relief from some material evil. By the agitations for commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity the minds of the people have been awakened to the needs of a continental market, while the fate of the old reciprocity treaty has taught them that there is no security for permanence but union. On the other hand, it may safely be said that the political abhorrence of union, of which much has been said by one of our ex-Governors-General and others who have discussed this question in the American press, has hardly any real existence so far as the mass of the Canadian people is concerned. That a Continental Unionist cannot hope to be elected to Parliament is true only in this sense, that the nominations in Canada, as in the United States, are made by the party conventions, and neither of the Canadian parties has yet declared for continental union. It is most untrue if it means that a man well known to be personally in favor of continental union finds it impossible or even difficult on that account to get his election. Continental Unionism has no metropolitan organ, because the cities are the chief centres of the opposite party, and the advertising is in protectionist hands. But it has a good deal of support, more or less outspoken, in the country press.

At the same time there is a powerful opposition, political, commercial, and social, besides that *vis inertiæ*, which, whether it be a real force in physics or not, is a real force in politics. There is the Governor-General with his court at Ottawa, and the Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces. There is the official class, naturally desirous of keeping the government at Ottawa. There are the members of the Ottawa Legislature in both Houses who do not feel sure of translation to Washington. There are the protected manufacturers who form a powerful and compact phalanx, how powerful and how compact Americans know full well. There is a body of government contractors and others connected with government works. There are lawyers looking to government for judgeships and holding government briefs. There is the Anglican Church, monarchical in the colonies, as well as at home. Nor is the influence of British titles and of admission to the British court and aristocratic circles on the rich trifling ; it is surprisingly great considering the age of reason in which we live. A sort of gentility is cultivated by the assumption of superiority to Yankees. In Canadian cities, as in every commercial community,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is a love of holiday soldiering, the Yankee being the imaginary foe. The strength of all these elements combined and uniting their powers of influence or intimidation in addition to the force of traditional or conventional sentiment can be easily understood; and it will be readily believed that in face of it the expression of sincere opinion is much restrained, and that a visitor or a reporter seeking to gauge Canadian sentiment may be greatly led astray. Those who have watched the course of Canadian opinion during the last twenty years will not believe that the obstacles to reunion are insurmountable; but to overcome them the concurrent efforts of its friends on both sides of the line will be required. Something in the nature of a plebiscite will also be necessary in order to take fairly the verdict of the Canadian people. At a general election questions of all kinds are thrown together and all sorts of influences prevail.

Injury to national spirit, as distinguished from British or Anti-American sentiment, there can hardly be said to be when a truly Canadian nationality has not been formed, Quebec, which is geographically the keystone of the confederation, having a French nationality of its own. Nor, for the same reason, would there be any loss of grandeur by incorporation with a nation which it may fairly be assumed will before long be the greatest in the world.

On the other hand, to the list of impediments is now to be added the overmastering power of the Canadian Pacific

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flock, together with the awakening in the Province itself of influences such as wait on railways and other progressive agencies, has of late been relaxing the sinews of clerical reaction; and if the Roman Catholic clergy of the United States show themselves favorable to union it is not likely that the resistance of their brethren in Quebec will be very strong.

Among the serious obstacles to reunion need not be reckoned British opposition, if once the decision of Canada in favor of union is declared. Canada has been almost officially told that she is at liberty, whenever she thinks fit, to become independent; and if she is at liberty to become independent there can be nothing to forbid her making use of her independence by uniting herself politically to the continent of which she forms a part. It is true that of late there has been in England a wave of imperialist sentiment. But it is confined to a small and imaginative class. Among the democracy, which has now the upper hand, the desire of checking democratic progress in this hemisphere by means of a monarchical and aristocratic Canada does not exist. Friendship and trade with the American people are what the British democracy desires, and its leaders would be perfectly open to the argument that these objects could be secured only by resigning a political supremacy which is dangerous as well as barren and ceasing to interfere with the development of humanity on a continent with which Great Britain has politically nothing to do.

It is always taken for granted that in any negotiations for union the authority of the mother country as well as Canada's freedom of choice will be duly recognized and her sanction sought for any change.

The dealings of the Government and people of the United States with the Canadian question hitherto have not been a cause for pride. First, by the denial of amnesty to the Loyalists a hostile community was formed in the north, and Great Britain, who very likely would have retired, was compelled in honor to retain her position here. Natural affinities, however, at length prevailed, and by 1812, as we learn from the dispatches of Prevost and Brock, the American connection had so far taken hold on Canada that Canadians were extremely unwilling to obey the call to arms. By that miserable war all was thrown back. Before 1837 a party favorable to American connection had again

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed, but the people of the United States left it to its fate, permitting on that occasion just enough of filibustering on the border to revive ill feeling between the two communities. In 1854 there was a strong movement in favor of union on commercial grounds, and a manifesto was signed by a large number of leading men in the colony, including the late Premier of the Dominion. This Lord Elgin was enabled to extinguish, by the reciprocity treaty at Washington, the Democratic party playing into his hands because they feared that Canada, if brought into the Union, would turn the balance against slavery.

The next stage in the history was the Fenian raid, which the American Government permitted in its resentment against the British aristocracy, of whose offences Canada was entirely innocent. At the same time the reciprocity treaty was denounced. Once more the evil spirit was evoked.

The other day a movement was set on foot on both sides of the line in favor of commercial union, which, though it would have left the political question untouched, would have been pretty sure, from the intimacy of the connection which it would have formed, the general relations of the two peoples being what they were, to lead in the end to union pure and simple. This policy received the unanimous support of the House of Representatives and failed by only one vote of unanimous support in the Senate. We were beginning to build on its success when suddenly it was not only renounced but reversed, and instead of commercial union we had the McKinley Act. Now another change of policy looms in view. In face of such gyrations how can unionist combination and effort be carried on?

The first thing needed if continental union is to be brought about will be something like a steady and consistent policy on the part of the Washington administration, combined with a bearing perfectly friendly towards Canada. President Harrison was little studious of sentimental effect and he never showed Canada the friendly side of the shield.

Is a steady and consistent policy possible for a democracy, the government of which is always changing hands? Can party, where it is the ruling power, be so far restrained within the bounds of patriotic duty as to refrain from factious manœuvring when vital objects of external policy are concerned? Has the American people in renouncing immoral aggrandizement also re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nounced national aspiration? Can local interests, when a great question presents itself, be kept in subordination to the interests of the whole country? These are queries which the treatment of the Canadian question by the American Government and Congress in the coming years will go far to answer, and the answer will not be devoid of instruction as to the probable future of government by the people.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW CHOLERA CAN BE STAMPED OUT.

BY ERNEST HART, EDITOR OF THE "BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL," AND CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH SOCIETY OF ENGLAND.

WHEN cholera first spread westward from its home in India, across Asia and Europe, its characteristics were so unusual that it was attributed to "telluric," "meteoric," "atmospheric," and such like mysterious influences; indeed, at the present day there are still many, I regret to know, who attach undue weight to such views. For my own part, I think it is high time that these old notions were put aside, and that the spread of cholera should be looked at practically, in the light of the accumulated evidence afforded by all the great epidemics of the past. That accumulated, and unhappily still accumulating. evidence clearly shows that cholera is a filth disease of specific character, carried by dirty people to dirty places, and there spread by the use of dirty water. With pure water, pure air, pure soil, and pure habits, cholera need not be feared by any nation or by any individual.

To Snow belongs the great honor of being the first to recognize water as a medium of disseminating cholera. His deductions to this effect, from his observations of cholera in England between 1849 and 1854, were confirmed by the elaborate investigations of Farr and Simon. In 1866, following in the same footsteps, I was instrumental in tracing the disastrous cholera epidemic of that year in East London to the distribution of polluted and partially filtered water from the River Lea by the East London Water Company. Since that startling experience I have been convinced that specifically polluted water is not merely an occasion or adjuvant cause, but the *causa causans* of almost every great epidemic of Asiatic cholera, and I have observed that when the use of the infected water has been abandoned or cut off the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

epidemic has ceased. These views have been fully borne out by a close observation of each successive cholera outbreak within the last thirty years.

ENGLISH EXPERIENCES.

Epidemic of 1831-3.—In England, cholera first appeared in October, 1831, and until the summer of 1833 ravaged various parts of the kingdom. Its extension was so sudden and mysterious that it was popularly looked upon as a visitation of Providence beyond human control. The new disease was carefully studied, and its affinity for the poor, ill-fed, unhealthy parts of the population, and for the unclean, ill-ventilated and crowded districts was fully recognized, but its relation to the water supplies seems to have received little thought. Yet, the general circumstances of the water supplies of England at that time were deplorably bad, and Dr. Snow a few years later collected information which led to the presumption that, as in subsequent epidemics, contaminated water in 1832 played an important part.

Epidemic of 1848-9.—In 1848 occurred the next great visitation of England by cholera. The disease rapidly overran the whole country, and before it had disappeared in epidemic form, towards the close of 1849, 53,293 of the English people had died from it, and 18,887 had died from "diarrhœa," out of a population of some 17,564,656 living in a great variety of circumstances. It was in August, 1849, whilst this epidemic was running its course, that Snow propounded his theory that a most important way in which the disease may be widely disseminated is "by the emptying of sewers into the drinking water of the community." He had found that in most towns in which the malady had prevailed to an unusual extent this means of communication had existed, and he has recorded numerous instances in support of his opinion. He held that the cholera of 1848 was brought to London from Hamburg, that it was increased by infected persons, that the infected sewage matter found its way partly through soil into the wells, and partly through sewers into the Thames and Lea from which a portion of the water supply of London was derived. This theory was adversely criticised at the time, in a report by Drs. Baly and Gull to the London College of Physicians, and, as Mr. N. C. Macnamara has well remarked, these physicians well-nigh nipped this doctrine in the bud, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thus did much to retard the progress of our knowledge of the etiology of cholera.

Epidemic of 1853–4.—Early in the summer of 1854 cholera had obtained a foothold in London, and the outbreak which occurred in St. James's, Westminster, in the neighborhood of the public pump in Broad Street, is of historic interest, as it is the earliest important instance in which the agency of water as a disseminator of cholera was clearly demonstrated. The first death in the parish was recorded early in August, 1854, and throughout that month a few deaths occurred each week, but during the week ending September 2, 78 deaths were registered; in the next week there were 287 deaths; in the following week there were 67, and then the mortality as quickly subsided as it had risen. By the beginning of November there had been some 700 fatal attacks in this single parish; that is to say, 22 out of every 1,000 persons living in the parish had died of the disease within three months. No satisfactory solution of this mysterious outbreak presenting itself Dr. Snow was called in to examine the water supplies. His published report shows the clearly-marked incidence of the disease on those who drank the water of the parish pump. It shows how the workers in one particular factory, where the water was always used, suffered severely from cholera, whilst those in an adjoining brewery, where the water was never used, escaped, and numerous instances of fatal attacks of cholera following the use of the treacherously sparkling water from this pump are detailed. On the drains of the house adjoining the well being opened it was found that there was a cesspool under a common privy, within three feet of the well, and at a higher level than that of the water in the well; that, the walls of the cesspool being rotten, the contents leaked into the surrounding soil; that the walls of the well were also rotten; and that there was distinct evidence of the cesspool contents having for a long time leaked into the well. In the house itself a child aged five months had died on September the 2d of so-called "diarrhœa," but with distinctly choleraic symptoms.

In this case it was a well that was at fault; but in 1848 and 1853, as Mr. (now Sir John) Simon clearly showed in his reports to the General Board of Health, Londoners were also the subjects of gigantic experiments at the hands of some of the water companies, who drew their supplies from the Thames and Lea

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at points where those rivers were grossly polluted with the sewage and out-scourings of the rapidly-growing metropolis. Carefully gathered statistics show that the people who drank dirty river water suffered from cholera greatly in excess of those whose water supply was from less polluted parts of the rivers.

Epidemic of 1866.—The next choleraic invasion of England was in 1866, and is memorable for the terrible experiment which was unconsciously carried out by another of the London water companies, at the expense of some 4,000 lives in East London. Early in the outbreak I was struck by its incidence on the area supplied with water by the East London Water Company, and I felt confident that it could only be due to a sudden specific pollution of the water supply. Acting on behalf of a great medical journal, I dispatched the late Mr. J. Netten Radcliffe to investigate the matter. After much trouble the result showed that, owing to changes having been made in their filtering apparatus, the company had sent out for a few days unfiltered water, or water in a very partially filtered state, direct from the River Lea, which had just at that moment become infected with choleraic discharges from a cottage of which the sewers were connected with the river, and in which a family infected with cholera had come to reside.

During this epidemic many other parts of England besides London furnished evidence of the relation of water supplies to the spread of cholera.

Since 1866 sanitary improvement throughout England has grown apace, and concurrently Asiatic cholera has not been able to extend or even to establish itself in the country, though cases have reached her shores on numerous occasions. The London water supply is better filtered and of better quality to-day than formerly, but it is still open to criticism in so far as it is derived from the Thames and the Lea at points below where those rivers still receive sewage. The immunity of water companies in distributing poisoned water is a curious and serious anomaly.

EGYPTIAN EXPERIENCES.

Since 1831 Egypt has been severely scourged by cholera at short intervals, but reliable data are not available earlier than the visitation of 1883, when cholera, appearing at Damietta in June, gradually invaded various towns of the Nile Delta, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reached Ghizeh and Cairo by July 16. According to Dr. Sandwith 58,511 deaths from cholera occurred throughout Egypt in 1883 amongst a population of 6,765,000. The definite origin of the epidemic has been much disputed, though there seems to have been ample opportunity for the introduction of the specific infection into Damietta. Once started, however, the condition of Egypt, especially as regards water supply, was, I can say from personal observation, exactly such as would favor the extension of the disease. The Nile is the main source of water supply to the country, and Dr. Sandwith, Sir W. Guyer Hunter, and others, have fully shown the fearful extent to which that river has been and is habitually polluted with human and other filth. Great improvement in the condition of Egypt has taken place during the last ten years, but the question of providing Cairo with proper drainage is still in abeyance, and the water supply of the country is also still far from being satisfactory.

FRENCH EXPERIENCES.

Marseilles has earned an unenviable notoriety as regards cholera in recent years. In 1883 there were some concealed cases; in 1884, 1,777 deaths were recorded; in 1885 there were 1,039 cholera deaths; in 1892 there were some 90 deaths, and in February, 1893, nearly 100 deaths. The insanitary state of the town is notorious, and there is much evidence, which limitations of space prevent me here from referring to in detail, that its public water supply, especially where derived from the sewage-polluted river Huveaune, has been responsible for the epidemics referred to.

Toulon also has suffered severely from cholera at various times, and both its sanitary state and its water supply have been by no means satisfactory.

In 1884 the disease spread from Marseilles throughout the southern and southwestern departments of France, and, as the result of local investigations, Doctor Proust reported that water played an important part in its transmission.

A very detailed account of the cholera epidemic of 1884 in France has been written by Dr. L. H. Thoinot, of Paris, and a concise abstract of it is to be found in Doctor Shakespeare's report on cholera in Europe and India. It shows that the disease spread from place to place by means of soiled personal effects, by small

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

water-courses which had become contaminated with choleraic discharges, or the washing therein of soiled linen, and by the movements of persons experiencing an active or latent attack of cholera.

The Department of Finistère, in the northwest corner of France, furnishes a very vivid object-lesson in the spread of cholera by dirt, sewage-polluted well-waters, and specifically contaminated public fountains, as is shown in the recent very able and interesting report on the subject by Monsieur Henri Monod, who was formerly Prefect of Finistère, and also in the reports made by Doctor Proust after local investigations on behalf of the Comité Consultatif d'Hygiène Publique de France.

In November, 1884, there was a sharp outbreak of cholera in the western suburbs of Paris, the mortality rising rapidly day by day from 1 on November 3 to 96 on November 10, and then as rapidly declining, in the manner characteristic of water-borne epidemics, and I had excellent reasons for believing that the epidemic was due to the temporary distribution of a highly-polluted water to particular districts of the city. Again, in 1892, Paris, more especially its western and northwestern suburbs, was once more somewhat severely visited by cholera. Breaking out in Paris in a crowded prison at Nantarre, on the west of Paris, the disease soon spread through the neighboring districts, and before the end of the year 977 deaths had been chronicled.

There is a very general consensus of opinion that the consumption of the Seine water was at the root of this serious outbreak, as it has been at the root of previous epidemics. The suburban districts in the north and northwest—those districts, in fact, where cholera raged in 1892, and where it began in 1884—draw their water from the Seine after it has passed through Paris and been fouled by steamer traffic, by the filth from the cholera and linen washed in its floating wash-houses, by innumerable private sewers and by the contents of the main sewers of Paris at Asinieres and St. Denis. Happily, works have been undertaken to improve the Parisian water supply.

ITALIAN EXPERIENCES.

It is to Marseilles and Toulon that Italy is indebted for the severe epidemic of cholera which swept over the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country in the autumn of 1884. Breaking through the quarantines on the Italian frontier, the disease was carried by fugitive workmen throughout the country, and before the end of the year some 27,000 attacks of cholera and upwards of 14,000 deaths had occurred, at least 44 out of the 66 Italian provinces having been visited.

The severest outbreak occurred in Naples. Introduced there in August, 1884, from Marseilles, the attacks and mortality rose by rapid daily strides, until September 11, and then as rapidly fell. Between August 23 and November 9, some 12,345 cases and 7,086 deaths occurred amongst a population of 492,908. At that period the water supply of Naples was mainly derived from trenches running from house to house underground, and was exposed to direct contamination, not only by soakage of filth, but by the reckless practice of washing in the trenches linen soiled with choleraic discharges. In the following year Naples was supplied with pure water from a distant mountain stream (the Serino), and there followed a marked immunity of the city from cholera, notwithstanding the presence of the disease in the neighborhood. In 1888, however, an injury to the Serino water conduit led to a temporary return to the old system, and two sharp epidemics of cholera at once ensued, but ceased upon the resumption of the purer supply.

In September, 1884, the disease reached Genoa. After a few sporadic cases, a sudden and widespread explosion occurred between the 21st and 24th of September, the rich and poor being indiscriminately attacked. Genoa has a fine supply of naturally good water, brought from a distance by three aqueducts. On close investigation it was observed that of the first 300 cases of cholera, 93 per cent. were in houses supplied by one of those aqueducts (the Nicolay), and on following that aqueduct to its commencement, near the village of Busalla, 13 miles distant, a colony of workmen was found encamped. Cholera had broken out in Busalla on September 14, and inquiry disclosed the fact that the clothing of the workmen, both of the sick and of the healthy, was washed in the river Scrivia, which feeds the Nicolay Aqueduct. The supply of this water to Genoa was promptly stopped on September 28, and the epidemic at once rapidly declined.

In 1885 the most severe epidemic occurred in Palermo, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sicily. Into this somewhat unsavory town the disease was brought by sea, notwithstanding a stringent quarantine, and between the middle of September and the middle of November 5,535 cases, of which 2,959 were fatal, occurred, among a population of about 275,000. In Palermo the water is obtained partly from open trenches passing beneath the houses, as at Naples; partly from public fountains, and partly from wells which are exposed to the most filthy contamination. Apart from other pollutions, the water trenches are fouled through the very common custom of washing clothes in them. Doctor Albonesi was, at the time, director of the local sanitary council, and to his enlightened and vigorous administration, and prompt dealing with the dangerous water sources, is due the early termination of the epidemic.

SPANISH EXPERIENCES.

In 1885 Spain was the scene of a cholera outbreak of exceptional ferocity. Introduced into Alicante, on the south-east coast, in spite of quarantine, in August, 1884, the disease slumbered through the following winter, and in April, 1885, burst into an epidemic at Jativa and Alcira, when, evading sanitary cordons, it was soon carried far and wide by the dispersing laborers. Between February 5 and December 31, 1885, 2,247 local governments, having an aggregate population of 6,575,641, had been invaded, and 338,685 cases and 119,624 deaths had occurred.

Sanitation and domestic hygiene are of a very primitive description in Spain. Filth is allowed to accumulate, there is rarely any drainage properly so called, and the water supply is for the most part derived from the open and unprotected rivers and streams. In a work published in 1886, Mr. George Higgin has, by comparative pictures of the facts respecting a number of typical towns, very clearly shown that the Spanish epidemic of 1885 was *par excellence* water-borne. He shows that the disease never became truly epidemic or dangerous in any Spanish city in which there was a pure supply of water, and where proper means were taken to guard against the sources being polluted from any specific choleraic poison. He shows how, in this way, the cities of Toledo, Seville, Malaga and Madrid escaped comparatively lightly, whilst such places as Aranjuez, Saragossa, Granada and Valencia suffered very lightly.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUSSIAN EXPERIENCES IN 1892.

The complete history of the fearful cholera mortality in Russia in 1892 still remains to be written; but what we know of it bears out previous experiences as to the influences of infected water. In a series of papers recently published in the *Lancet*, Dr. Frank Clemow, of St. Petersburg, has collected a large number of facts bearing this out. A particularly instructive case is narrated by the United States Consul at Tashkent, in Turkestan. At Ashabad the cholera had already disappeared early in August, 1892, and the event was celebrated with much rejoicing. The Governor-General gave a dinner, but one-half of the guests died of cholera within twenty-four hours. Further, out of the 13,000 inhabitants of Ashabad, 1,300, or ten per cent., died within forty-eight hours. The cause of this outbreak was traced to a small stream of water which supplied the town, and which, it was found, had been fouled by filth from a small Turcoman village on its banks, where cholera had broken out four days previously.

CHOLERA AT HAMBURG IN 1892.

Cholera was officially announced in Hamburg on August 21, 1892, but it had been found present in the town for some days previously. The influence of the public water supply in disseminating the disease may be seen in the incidence of the disease respectively on Hamburg, Altona and Wandsbeck, the three towns which make up the Greater Hamburg. Wandsbeck, with a population of 20,571, had 64 cases (3.1 per mille), and 43 deaths (2.0 per mille); Altona, with 173,279 inhabitants, had 572 cases (3.9), with 328 deaths (2.3); Hamburg State, with a population of 622,530, had 17,974 cases (28.8), and 7,611 deaths (12.2); or, taking only the infected parts, the town and suburbs of Hamburg, among 579,907 inhabitants there were 17,891 cases (30.8) and 7,582 deaths (13). Wandsbeck, which suffered less than the other two, is supplied with spring water, whereas Altona and Hamburg derive their water from the Elbe. Altona, however, gets its water very far down, at Blankensee, where the river is cleaner than in Hamburg, and passes it through a good gravel filter, unlike Hamburg, which takes its water from the harbor, contaminated with sewage and absolutely unfiltered. Happily,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steps have been taken to secure purer water to Hamburg in the future.

INDIAN EXPERIENCES.

India is generally referred to as the "home of cholera," the disease being established endemically throughout a wide area. This, however, is not, as most Indian authorities once believed and many would even now have us believe, due to any mysterious or unpreventable causes, but in virtue of conditions which may all of them be removed, and which in time, I trust, will be removed. In India, as elsewhere, water has been the chief nurse and disseminator of cholera, and I believe that if every town and village in India were provided with pure and properly protected water, the so-called "endemic area" would soon become indefinite. Dr. M. C. Furnell, who has had great experience as Surgeon-General of Madras, is firmly of opinion that the general method of the propagation of cholera in India is by means of specifically polluted water, and he has had no difficulty in finding masses of facts in support of his opinions.

The experiences of Calcutta, as observed by Dr. W. J. Simpson, the Health Officer of that city, go to show that those persons who have an abundant and pure water supply, namely, the Europeans and better class of natives—escape cholera epidemics, except in isolated instances which can generally be accounted for; while the natives, who necessarily depend on tank water, suffer severely when a tank becomes polluted by the excreta of a cholera patient. It must be remembered that the natives bathe and wash their utensils and clothes in the tank because it is the only available place for doing so, and that they use the water of the tank, contaminated as it is, in addition, by soakage and sewage, for cooking and drinking, because it is the only available water supply for domestic purposes. Dr. Simpson raises a very earnest cry against the scarcity of pure water. The first requisite for Howrah and the suburbs of Calcutta is a liberal water supply, whilst Calcutta itself needs an increased supply.

Madras also furnishes instructive experiences. Before the introduction of the Red Hills water supply Madras suffered each year severely from cholera; but since 1872, when the water supply was first opened, the disease has practically disappeared from the city. The experiences of Pondicherry, Gopaulpore, Nagpur,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Salem, Peshawar, and other places, may be quoted as showing a marked immunity from cholera, when pure uninfected water has been in use.

Religious pilgrimages, also, are a fruitful means of spreading cholera in the East, owing to the habit of bathing and drinking the water of the sacred wells and pools. Graphic descriptions of the Mecca pilgrimage of 1866, or of the Ardhodoya Jog held at Calcutta in 1891, and of the Kumb festival at Hurdwar, 1891, are before me and bear out this statement.

Under English rule much has been done in India in the way of sanitary reform, but very much still remains to be done, and I cannot but recognize the very heavy responsibilities which rest on England in regard to this matter. It appears to me that the sanitary administration of India requires to be radically remodelled, and I venture to submit that this could without insuperable difficulties be effected. I would suggest (1), an Imperial Sanitary Department attached to the Government of India; (2), a Provincial Sanitary Department attached to each of the Provincial Governments, such as Bengal, North West Provinces, Punjab, Madras, Bombay, etc., and (3), a Local Sanitary Department attached to each municipality, district board, etc.

I have been unable within the space here at my disposal to attempt to give more than the merest indication of the mass of evidence which I have accumulated, showing that water is the chief if not—in Europe—the sole agency in the spread of epidemic cholera. With the scourge close at our gates let me urge upon every community and every responsible authority in America to profit by these lessons before it is too late; to put their houses in order and secure purity of water especially, but also of soil, of air, of habits. This is the best, the only successful, weapon wherewith to protect ourselves against cholera. Quarantine is a sieve rather than a protective armor.

ERNEST HART.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN HOTEL OF TO-DAY.

BY GEN. RUSH C. HAWKINS AND W. J. FANNING.

GENERAL HAWKINS:

SOME one has said: "There are two occasions when the American needs rest—when he starts out upon his vacation and when he returns from it." The wise author of that saying might have added: "The deluded individual when he moves out upon his period of anticipated rest should provide himself with an extra or summer stomach of copper, or of some other strong material, capable of digesting the culinary results which usually flow from this announcement: 'The cuisine will be first class in every respect, and the management will leave nothing undone to promote the comfort and pleasure of guests.'" This is the usual form adopted by "Mine Host," from the eastern boundaries of the State of Maine to the southern end of California.

Deceived and lured on to the destruction of my digestive organs by the average spring flood of announcements, clothed in all the fascinating devices of the printers' and engravers' art, I was led to undertake a campaign among the summer resorts, more or less fashionable and all very high priced, five dollars *per diem*, at least, being the usual charge, no matter how bad or very bad the accommodation.

The first halting-place was selected with special reference to altitude and isolation of the hotel from other buildings. This establishment advertised special terms up to the first of August, which meant less than five dollars per day. But, upon application to the manager upon the premises, I was told that those terms had to be arranged in New York or Philadelphia before the opening of the hotel. The location of this particular hotel is unsurpassed upon this continent. The buildings are large and the whole well ventilated, but two weeks was all we could stand of its much advertised culinary perfections.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our next move involved a railway journey of more than four hundred miles, at the end of which we found ourselves at one of the most beautiful of New England villages, and lodged in a new summer hotel, which, as to construction and convenient arrangements, is as nearly perfect as possible. The whole, in fact, is nothing less than a work of art. The furniture, carpets, table appointments, etc., etc., were in perfect taste, and the service in every department all that the most exacting could desire. But, as usual, the kitchen in its leading features was a failure. After fifteen days at this place we returned and spent a week in New York, which proved to be the only comfortable one of the whole summer.

To arrive at the third objective point involved a rest for one night at the most populous and popular resort in our whole country. For that purpose we selected the most "swell" and "quiet" hotel of the place, where the late dinner and breakfast proved to be quite the worst, as to quality, of the whole season. The dinner *menu* must have contained about one hundred and ten items, and the one for breakfast at least seventy-five. We were tempted to taste a certain "fancy dish," *entreé* in other words, which purported to have been made of *capon* and *truffles*. It proved to be a sort of a cold pressed hash of veal and beef tongue, with not a particle of *capon* or even chicken in it, while the *truffles* were a composition of a shining black substance of the texture of isinglass.

Four hours more of a railway journey carried us to an almost new hotel created and owned by a rich corporation. Its location is a marvel of beauty, situated upon a high bluff near the shore of a lake, commanding views of two extensive ranges of mountains, and each combined with a long stretch of a most picturesque body of water. The description only partially indicates a location of singular beauty, and no better could be found for a summer hotel. The building is spacious and airy, the rooms large enough, furnished in good taste, and there is an extensive *foyer* on the first floor, where all the guests can assemble for music and conversation. The latter is a most fascinating feature of the establishment, which, it is to be hoped, all builders of "Summer Resorts" may imitate. As to the laying out of grounds and general hotel features all had been done that fairly good taste and the liberal expenditure of money could accomplish, and if we could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have existed upon its surrounding atmosphere alone we might have prolonged our visit to the end of the season. But, unfortunately, this we could not do, and the demands enforced by the mere fact of human existence compelled us to eat of the manipulations of a so-called *chef*, which proved to be as defective as any we had encountered, and after a sojourn of two and a half weeks we made a compulsory departure, with a completely demoralized digestion, possibly damaged beyond repair. So our campaign among the "Resorts," undertaken with confidence and courage, accompanied with an unwarrantable amount of hope, ended in defeat and disaster, which compelled a retreat to the much-dreaded afflictions of an over-heated city, to which was added a possible attack of cholera, all of which we preferred to encounter rather than continue our sojourn at the superior summer resorts

The defects in the American system of hotel-keeping are general and organic, for which no particular landlord or manager can or should be held responsible. Not one in fifty among them knows anything, practically, about cooking, and they have to depend upon the supposed knowledge of a lot of German, French, Italian, and Irish upper scullions, who come over here, and easily pass themselves off for *chefs*. They are cheap, and that is the reason why the average American landlord and manager employs them. They are no more cooks than they are astronomers. In European kitchens they probably trimmed the joints, peeled potatoes, stirred the soup kettles and washed the onions, but were never permitted to interfere with a joint, *entrée* or a sauce. But, like other classes in Europe, they act upon the theory that anything is good enough for the Americans who like to be humbugged, and the American hotel-keeper is quite willing to take this particular class of impostors at their word.

Herr Freytag, a *chef* at the Russian embassy in Rome for more than thirty years, and afterwards the proprietor of the Hôtel des Iles Britanniques in that city, told me that a good bed, good soups, good bread and good tea and coffee were the foundations for an acceptable hotel, and he was right. As a rule, the American hotel is a failure in respect to all of these essentials. It is true, there are more good beds now than there were formerly, but neither the tea, coffee, soup nor bread has improved; if anything, they are worse than thirty years ago; now there is more pretence, *i. e.*, attempts at "style" at the expense of all comforts,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which have been banished from the average American machine hotel.

Capoul, the French tenor, in one of his published letters about America, said: "This is a wonderful country, with the loftiest mountains, the longest rivers and the largest lakes, but without a soup." Fifty years ago Judge Grimke, a noted holder of Circuit Courts in South Carolina, ordered tea at a backwoods hotel; shortly after it was served he sent for the landlady, and astonished her by saying: "Madam, if this be tea bring me coffee, and if this be coffee bring me tea." This command could, with propriety, be given in nine-tenths of our hotels to-day. The usual hotel coffee would easily pass for some kind of medicine, and often the supposed tea defies recognition. The general aim seems to be to hoodwink patrons with a show of great liberality—hence the dinner bill of fare with from eighty to one hundred and twenty-five items upon it, and the breakfast *menu* with from forty to seventy-five. Such a spread of printer's ink looks large, panders to national vanity and convinces the native that he is not being swindled.

It is quite unnecessary to write that not one in ten of those products of the kitchen named in the bill of fare are properly prepared or decently served. The vegetables are usually cold and soggy, often slopped with a nasty-looking and worse-tasting sauce; the joints are usually tough and cold; the flesh made dishes [*entrées*], with high sounding French names, neither taste nor smell like anything we have ever seen before; the sweets are often the better part of the dinner; but the fruits, in the majority of instances, are the cheapest and poorest that can be found.

The common theory of enormous liberality on the part of the proprietor is a delusion, for I have the information from rather reliable expert authority that in all the caravansaries where from one to ten hundred guests are lodged each day the cost of feeding never reaches forty cents a head, and that the leavings of these feasts are utilized in various ways and never wasted. If this be true, the apparent liberality is only another addition to our long list of national shams. When asked why the hotels in America do not adopt the Continental *table d'hôte* dinner, the answer always is: "Americans won't have it that way; they want more liberality;" and yet during the past twenty-five years I have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

met hundreds of Americans at the better French, Swiss, Italian, Belgian and German hotels, and have heard but a few find fault with the food or service. On the contrary, I have known many of them to ask : " Why cannot our hotels be managed like these?" The " why" is a hotel secret. It costs less to feed guests the American way than the other, and so long as that fact remains we can hope for no reform. And, besides, to serve a *table d'hôte* in the better French style requires good taste, knowledge and certain skill, qualities that can only be acquired by a long experience in first-class establishments, such as American hotel proprietors and managers know nothing of.

The American landlord applies the enforced theory of Colonel Sellers to the everyday actualities of hotel keeping. He has convinced himself that his guests do not need really palatable food ; they only want the illusion, *i. e.*, to see a certain liberal display of items with high-sounding names on the bill of fare, and dishes filled with some sort of a beyond-understanding substance, to correspond with a certain name, which can be supplied when ordered. No matter whether or not it is actual food fit to eat, it represents an item printed, and fulfils one part of the contract existing between the landlord and the guest.

The relations existing between a guest and proprietor of hotels can be expressed in a very few words. The former arrives, the attending room-clerk hands him a pen, he writes his name, and, if unknown to the clerk, is shown the most undesirable room in the house. This is what is called " trying it on," and if the guest does not " kick " he is entered upon the account books for not less than five dollars per day, exclusive of sundries. At the end of a certain stated period he receives his bill, but between the registration of his name and the reception of his bill he receives very little attention ; he has become a paying cog in one of the numerous wheels which constitute the machine known as an American hotel, where comforts are unknown and exorbitant charges are the rule.

The self-constituted experts that preside over these establishments felicitate themselves upon the fact that they understand their business, that they know how to " keep a hotel," and they are offended if their supposed accomplishments are not recognized ; no doubt they do keep hotels, *i. e.*, from a national standpoint. But, still, the monumental fact remains that a very large majority

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of them preside over manufactories for converting good materials into unpalatable and unhealthy food quite unfit for human consumption.

The subject of extortions by head waiters and their subordinates, which landlords do not attempt to regulate, demands heroic treatment in a separate paper. These annoying practices have become national and, as to amounts, unprecedented. At one of the very large hotels in Saratoga, where we remained over night upon our last return to New York, the service was most defective; our three meals were served by as many different waiters; we were "struck" by each, and by one in a most insolent manner. This evil is now quite beyond endurance and ought to meet with prompt and decisive resistanee.

RUSH C. HAWKINS.

MR. FANNING:

THE American is universally regarded as the most mercurial being on the face of the earth. Thoroughly domestic in his tastes and imbued with the deepest love for his home and country he, nevertheless, has a burning desire to see the great world around him, and whilst forever exclaiming that there is "no place like home" is seldom found in that heaven-favored spot. Hence the somewhat inelegant but very descriptive appellation of "globe trotter" that has been applied to him by Europeans.

This tendency to be constantly on the move has made the hotel one of the most interesting features of modern life to the average American citizen, for once he leaves the sacred hearth he must needs rely upon "mine host" to supply him with the things that make life worth living.

The inn of the past, though filling an important place in our literature, affords little or nothing in the way of practical instruction to the innkeeper of to-day. There is a dreamy, delightful atmosphere of poetry and romance—not to speak of tragedy—surrounding the classic inns of "ye olden time," and there is interwoven into their history many quaint and beautiful legends, but for all practical purposes the inn, which has supplied such rich material to English writers from Shakespeare to Dickens, is interesting to us only by way of comparison. It bears about the same relation to the modern hotel as the caravel in which Colum-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bus sailed over unknown seas, four hundred years ago, bears to the majestic steamship, which, in our day, sets at defiance both wind and wave, and plies between the old and new worlds with the accuracy and precision of a local ferryboat. There is indeed no other branch of commercial enterprise which has kept pace with the advance of civilization more thoroughly than that of hotel-keeping.

Prior to the discovery of the uses of steam the inn existed only as a temporary abode for those who travelled from the necessities of trade, or for other reasons of equal urgency. But with the advent of railroads and steamships hotels were called upon to provide accommodation not only for the wayfarer who journeyed from necessity, but also for that ever-widening stream of humanity that sought recreation and pleasure in travel. Thus it came to pass that the wayside inn of former ages, with its crude facilities for the entertainment of man and beast, gradually evolved into the magnificent palace of to-day, which, in many instances, surpasses in architectural beauty and interior decoration the best-appointed private dwellings.

It may be noted that the business of inn-keeping has not undergone a more radical change than has the character of the men engaged in it. The good-natured and jovial landlord who, in the olden time, stood at his doorway, in apron and cap, to welcome the coming and speed the parting guest, could little comprehend the vast and intricate system under which our great modern caravansaries are conducted. A genial and obsequious manner, coupled with a knowledge of making soup, made up the stock in trade of the average inn-keeper of a hundred years ago. But to establish and successfully manage one of the great hostelries to be found in any American city calls not only for large capital, but also the highest business capacity. The modern Boniface has personally no time to look after the comforts of his guests. He must give his undivided attention to a general supervision of the business, leaving to the heads of the various departments the working out of details, and trusting to the perfect working of his system to insure to his guests the comforts and convenience of a temporary home. He is public-spirited and progressive, ever ready to encourage and promote any event that is calculated to attract people to his town or city. In this he may be said to be actuated by selfish motives, but the com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munity at large share with him the benefits which flow from his practical and liberal conduct. In short, the magnitude and importance of the business, no less than the thoroughness with which it is conducted, make the hotel proprietor of to-day rank as the peer of any man engaged in the highest commercial circles.

Some idea of the enormous proportions the business of hotel-keeping has assumed in this country may be gained from the fact that there are in the United States upwards of thirty thousand hotels, exclusive of what may properly be termed inns and taverns and what are commonly known as apartment houses, although the latter are in many instances conducted as hotels, in that they have a common kitchen and dining-room.

During the past two years there have been opened in the city of New York four new hotels, the aggregate cost of which, including furniture, was upwards of ten millions of dollars. They are veritable palaces, both in architectural design and interior splendor, and yet they may be said to be only in keeping with a large number of hotels with which our citizens have for years been familiar. In proof of this, and as a notable fact, it may be mentioned that in the municipal tax levy for the current year the highest valuation put upon any building, but one, in the whole city of New York, is placed upon a hotel that has enjoyed a world-wide fame for more than thirty years; and another curious fact is, that the two hotels bearing the highest assessed valuations are two of the oldest in the city, thus illustrating the high character maintained by the hotels of New York for many generations.

The spirit of fraternity and good-fellowship existing among the landlords of the United States is most remarkable when it is considered how directly they are brought into competition with one another. And yet this hearty coöperation has been an important factor in the rapid development and improved character of the business. There is a national association, embracing in its membership nearly all the leading hotels of the country. There are also State and city associations. These bodies exercise a potent influence on legislation affecting the relations of landlord and guest, as well as excise and other questions. As a result the laws regulating the liability of inn-keepers have been greatly modified in recent years.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Formerly the landlord was liable as an insurer for the property of his guest to an unlimited extent, and enormous judgments were obtained against hotel proprietors by persons claiming to have brought valuable property into the hotel, which afterwards disappeared. The manager was entirely at the mercy of a dishonest patron. This common-law rule has, however, been changed in recent years by the legislatures of the various States, in nearly all of which the present liability of the hotel proprietor is limited to the loss of goods and merchandise not exceeding five hundred dollars in value, where it appears that such loss occurred without the fault or negligence of the proprietor.

There is no longer any liability upon the landlord for the loss of money, jewels or ornaments, whenever a safe is provided and notice of the fact posted in the office and public rooms of the hotel, and the guest neglects to deposit them with the clerk ; in the State of New York the liability for property thus deposited is limited to two hundred and fifty dollars, unless a written contract is entered into between the guest and landlord in person. Other equally radical changes in the law have been made in which the aim has been to meet the changed conditions by affording protection to both the landlord and the guest.

Much has been written upon the relative merits of the American and European hotels, and the different modes of conducting them. Unfortunately, however, it too often occurs that those who enter upon the discussion of this subject possess only a superficial knowledge thereof and not infrequently exhibit unmistakable prejudices, which warp their judgment and render their testimony of little or no value. There is the Anglo-maniac who, after a brief European experience, mistakes novelty for superiority, and, flattered by the profuse attentions and obsequiousness of the continental landlord and his assistants, hastily pronounces in favor of the foreign article.

On the other hand, we have the American of the provincial type, who is unable to recognize merit anywhere outside the domain of Uncle Sam. But the consensus of opinion expressed by unbiassed travellers, both European and American, is clearly in favor of the American hotel, taken as a whole. In its appointments it is far in advance of the hotels of Europe. Until quite recently it was an admitted fact that the American *cuisine* was inferior to that of Europe. This is no longer true of our best city

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establishments. On the contrary they now excel the hotels of Europe in the variety and, in many instances, in the quality of the viands.

A well-known writer recently observed that "the hotels of America are unquestionably the best and most splendid in the world, and their only approachable rivals some of the great hotels in Switzerland." The distinguished editor of the London *Morning Post*, in describing his recent trip to America, says:

"I shall never forget my feelings when a waiter bluntly placed before me for the first time a list of the food provided for breakfast—I cannot call it a *menu*—at one of the great hotels in New York, and asked what I would take. Being of an experimental turn of mind, and doubting, moreover, whether all these various dishes could exist anywhere but in the "catalogue," I used to amuse myself by testing the capabilities of the kitchen, but it never failed. The hotel is a magnificent, commanding structure of white marble, and is capable of accommodating a thousand guests. In every respect it is a first-class house. Its decorations and appointments are most sumptuous, and the service and cooking excellent. It is conducted on the American plan, as they call it, which is really very similar to the *pension* system at the Swiss hotels, though on a more expensive and luxurious scale."

The American hotels of to-day may be divided into three classes: (1) Those kept on the American plan, (2) those kept on the European plan, and (3) those in which those two methods are combined. In regard to these different plans each may be said to have its advantages. If you are in the city for a short time and have much running about to do, it is more advantageous to select a hotel on the European plan, as you thus save time and money by being able to take your meals wherever you may find it most convenient to do so, and in this case you have to pay only for what you get. In case of a more prolonged stay the hotel kept on the American plan is more economical, and therefore continues in favor with many people. In many of the more modern hotels both plans are adopted, so the guest may try one and then the other, and thus determine which pleases him most.

There is still another class of American hotels known as the "Summer Hotel," which seems to have deteriorated rather than advanced of late years. This is attributable to various causes; chief among them being a decided change in the popular taste from that which prevailed fifty years ago, when the large hotels of the summer resorts of America were the wonder of the old world, and formed a prominent feature in the tales of all travellers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who had crossed the Atlantic. Their enormous size, the perfection of their organization, the luxury of their furniture, the lavishness and excellence of their table were constant subjects of admiration in the European newspapers.

Of late years, however, these caravansaries have not been as popular as formerly, and the business of conducting a summer hotel has come to be regarded as precarious and unprofitable. This is largely due to the rapid increase of cottage life at the watering-places, and the habit, which has become so general, of going to Europe for vacation. Owing to the short season during which business can be done it has become very difficult to realize any profit from the large summer hotel properties, and hence their imperfect service, as compared with their more prosperous city rivals.

The custom of feeing the waiter has become as universal in America as it is in Europe. It excites the railing of the most accomplished masters of profanity, and is a target for the professional humorist of the newspaper. Nevertheless, the American waiter, "wrapt in his invulnerable armor of conscious power, demands his fees, as the tyrant of old demanded the submission and the goods of his subjects." He has the key to the situation, that is, of the dining-room and pantry, and through him alone are the flesh pots accessible.

It is perhaps impossible to devise any means of doing away with this custom of tipping the waiter. The American landlord cannot be held responsible for its existence. He pays his waiters good wages, which is not true of Europe, where many hotels do not pay any wages, but receive pay from the waiters for the privilege of serving the guests. Consequently the waiter must rely upon his *pourboire* for all that he receives. This robs him of the independence enjoyed by the American waiter, and doubtless accounts for the subserviency observable among European servants.

The American system has another advantage in that the guest is not expected to confer "tips" upon any but those who have rendered him actual service. That veteran journalist, G. W. Smalley, in a recent letter, in which he describes the hotels of Germany, says :

"The happiness of the guest, after leaving the hotel, consists in the reflection that he has made others happy. That he has feed the waiter who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brought him his coffee in the mornings, the chambermaid, or perhaps two chambermaids, the porter who brought up his trunks and the porter who carried them down, a third who put them on the cab, a fourth who looked on while it was loaded, a fifth who unstrapped his trunks and blacked his boots, the uniformed conductor of the rickety elevator, the head waiter in the restaurant, in addition to regular tips to the actual waiter, four small boys in silver-laced caps. Then he gives all the money he has left to the hall porter himself. The manager comes out to wish you, with a low bow, a good journey, and you rather wonder whether he, too, expects to be tipped."

Such a picture as this is enough to make the average American rejoice over the comparative immunity he enjoys from the *pourboire,* which is the bane of all European travellers.

It may be truly said, in conclusion, that there is no other feature of our municipal life that has given to our imperial city such world-wide fame as the magnificent hotels of which her citizens are justly proud. The stranger within our gates may find many subjects for adverse criticism, but he invariably admits that in the matter of hotels New York stands unrivalled among the cities of the world.

WILLIAM J. FANNING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FRENCH PEASANTRY.

BY THE MARQUISE DE SAN CARLOS.

THE French working classes as a race may be divided into two distinct sets: the field laborers and the city workmen. A study of the latter, however brief, would carry us inevitably deep into the socialist question, aud we therefore prefer to dismiss it altogether and to limit our sketch to a rapid glimpse of the field laborer, the genuine country peasant.

We regret to say that a change for the worse has been observable of late years in this silent plodding econonomical kind-hearted race, which may be attributed to the abuse of spirits, the craze for city life and the new testamentary laws. The latter, issued during the French Revolution, decreed the division of every distinct species of property into equal shares among the inheritors. Their ostensible object was the enforcement of universal equality by preventing parental preferences while insuring to each child an equal share of his father's inheritance. But the real object was the breaking up of aristocratic preponderance by the ever-succeeding subdivision of its landed property and long-accumulated wealth. There is no longer the fear of disinheritance to keep within bounds the young scapegrace; there is no leaving the old homestead to the best manager on the condition of yearly instalments to other heirs. Everything must be broken up about once in thirty years and begun over again by new inexperienced hands. Many wait impatiently for the death of the old parents, then hurry off to the city where one out of a thousand succeeds, and one out of a hundred comes back to end his days as a menial in what was perhaps his father's house.

To avoid these endless subdivisions of his hard earned savings the simple-minded peasant has found no better expedient than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the suppression of heirs generally, and now cynically declares, like the noble millionnaire, that he cannot afford to have more than one child! In fact, were it not for the overflow of bordering nations, Spain, Germany, and especially Belgium, the want of hands in France would become a serious calamity.

Thus the law created to destroy castellated power and wealth has impoverished only the peasant, and produces, after several generations of this piece-mealing system, a nomad race that roam over the country at large or swarm together in populous cities, finding their new home in the liquor-saloon, where alone they are welcomed with outstretched arms.

The steady field laborer is very orderly in his habits and has a good dose of common sense. Each province has marked characteristics of its own. The Bretons, for instance, are staunch, enthusiastic Catholics and royalists, a stubborn race with a will of its own: excellent sailors, poor agriculturists and true patriots. The Provençal, on the other hand, has much of the Andalusian in his character; something too of the Irishman: witty, poetical, improvident, grandiloquent, hot-headed, smelling of garlic and personated in Daudet's inimitable *Tartarin de Tarascon*. The Norman peasant is suspicious, miserly, cautious, a good bargainer who has never yet been known to commit himself by a decided yea or nay. The Northern man is clearsighted in business matters and not overburdened with heart or imagination. He would let his house burn to the ground without caring to see the blaze provided it were insured.

Instead of branching off in search of the different shades which form the variegated moral coloring of each separate province, we will circumscribe our observations to the ever-widening zone that encircles Paris, and limit our sketch of French country folk to the village of "*X sur N*," situated at some fifty miles from the great throbbing heart of the country.

Like every French village, it has its *chateau* and its old stone church. Both are often historically or archæologically interesting. *Chateaux* vary much in size and splendor. Churches are all damp, dark and cold; and when not beautiful specimens of gothic architecture, as a whole, are sure to have, at least, some curious old altar or window, or perhaps even a transept or choir of marvellous grace and ornamentation. But in the village I have chosen I regret to say there exists but one curious Norman door worth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

visiting, and the *chateau* itself is by no means a *monument historique,* but simply a charming, unpretentious specimen of Louis XIII. style. Its park, which covers some twenty acres, is surrounded by a high stone wall, and there are long rows of lindens, trimly cut, so as to form deeply-shaded avenues. The lawns and commons of this pretty little *chateau* are exactly like those of every other *chateau* that respects itself.

On the first Sunday after my arrival at *X sur N,* the mayor in a long frockcoat and monstrous chimney-pot, attended by two municipal councillors, came to pay me his respects. He was a wizened up little man, who had held his office for forty years. On week days this important personage wears the blue blouse, the insignia of the people, and may be seen ploughing his own fields in all the glory of honest labor and comfortable dirt. In rather hesitating flourishes the little man welcomed me to his commune, and told me that I might hang my bracelets on the trees without danger, for at *X sur N* there were no manufactories, and consequently no anarchists; there were no poor, and consequently no criminals. Everybody owned his own homestead, be it a thatched hovel, or a spacious farm.

No manufactories, no mines, no railway station, no poor, no criminals! Surely the village of *X sur N* must be an earthly paradise. Such, indeed, were my feelings as I awoke on the morrow and experienced the soothing influence of that delicious calm which belongs to early morning in the country. I threw open my windows and leaned on the wide, low sill, breathing in the fresh air. An old-fashioned vegetable garden, with borders of peonies and roses, lay before me; to right and left soft expanses of greensward, enlivened by *parterres* of brilliantly-colored flowers. Sloping fields of wheat and rye waved in the distance; pines and oak trees rose in clusters among undulating hillocks, and the village itself nestled cosily in the midst of the pretty picture. Its new brick cottages, telling of modern comforts for the poor, and its old thatched huts, poetically covered with rich green moss, were strung like the beads of a chaplet along the road. Birds were twittering in the bushes close by, a few sang out loudly in the trees and gradually the buzz of insects became more and more distinct, until at last it seemed as though I could hear the plants breathing in their upward growth and see them slowly rising in search of the warm golden sun. Presently I saw

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a man dart through the garden with a raised cudgel and before I had time to cry out another human form fell bleeding to the ground. My God! could this be crime? Had I then forgotten that men and women lived in the quiet village of *X sur N*, and that there were no less than three drinking establishments corrupting and lowering the moral and physical condition of the two hundred souls that formed the population of this very small place.

Hurrying forth I met a woman also hastening to the spot. It was the old story: love, jealousy and drink! And as each humble neighbor told me of his or her life's sorrow—for the simple-minded are ever glad to find sympathetic listeners to their tales of woe—methinks I discovered as much misery in the quiet country village as I had left behind me in the great noisy city.

Yes, Mère Jeannette had left the place and gone to Paris when a girl of fourteen to follow a brilliant young count who used to come shooting in the neighborhood. Within a year Jeannette had sent home a baby boy to be brought up by her mother. Three others followed in rapid succession, and only twenty years after did the pretty Jeannette return herself, a worn and faded woman, to find her mother among the dead and her sons hardened against her. In her loneliness she married a handsome, good-for-nothing village drunkard, and is now spending the last days of her life quarrelling with her husband.

Then we have Mère Millet, who never misses mass of a Sunday, but who beats her children black and blue and is so universally hated that nothing will make the neighbors believe her husband died a natural death. Next door comes Mère Noirot. She is ninety years old and looks like a picture as she sits by her window from morning to night at her big-wheeled silk spindle. All French people are neat and orderly, but in neatness and order Mère Noirot surpasses everybody else. It is indeed a pleasant thing to watch her as she folds up her great silver skeins of shining silk, or stands before her carved oaken press counting over the treasures contained therein. Yet it is pleasanter still to see her watering her flowers of a morning or carrying them back into her kitchen if it be eventide and she fear a coming frost. When the light of day ceases, Mère Noirot goes to bed, be it ever so early.

I took a friend to visit the old peasant, just as I would have taken her to visit some curious ruin in the neighborhood. Fear-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing that she had misunderstood my introduction, Mère Noirot repeated after me: "Madame, or Mademoiselle?" "Mademoiselle," I answered. "Well, it is time Mademoiselle thought about getting a man," replied the old woman bluntly. "No," I returned, "Mademoiselle prefers life without the encumbrance of a husband." "Ah! Mademoiselle is going to be a nun," continued Mère Noirot. "No," I returned again, "Mademoiselle is not going to be a nun. She paints all day long and she is very happy as she is."

Not to care to marry, unless one had a religious vocation, was indeed a thing neither Mère Noirot nor any other French woman had as yet considered a possibility. But there was such calm resolution in my friend's countenance, that, to my surprise, the peasant believed her, and after a few moments' silence she exclaimed with a sigh: "Well! I don't know but that Mademoiselle is right after all. I never had much comfort as long as my husband lived. Only nowadays, when night comes on and I have to stop working, I feel sore lonesome!"

The leading farmer of the neighborhood is a very rich man. He owns over a hundred acres of land, eighty sheep and twenty cows and half as many horses. His wife was educated at Dijon in a fashionable boarding school, and brought him eighty thousand francs dowry. Mulot has always from ten to twenty laborers at work on his farm, yet his wife keeps no servants. Madame Mulot cooks for the men, attends to the pigs and poultry and does all the milking and house-cleaning. Their only daughter is being carefully brought up in the city and is destined to finish her education in a still more expensive and fashionable boarding school than her mother's. But when Mademoiselle Virginie comes home, will she be quite as willing to work as her mother is? and if not, will she find a husband belonging to a higher station ready to marry her? It is a risk that may bring misfortune on the thrifty farmstead.

The field laborer lives principally on bread, lard and vegetables, with a bit of meat or a rabbit on Sundays. He never enters his hut without cutting off a chunk of stale bread with his pocket-knife, and, like all French people, he does not know what it is to taste pure water, but drinks home-made cider, beer or wine. His family has probably lived for six hundred years on the same bit of land! Ever tilling the same earth, planting and replanting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it, he has grown of the earth earthy. In days of trouble his family used to count on the lords of the land for assistance, but since the revolution the mighty have grown hardened towards the peasant and the peasant hates them back in return.

As to the girls, they are ever ready to cast away their pretty provincial *coiffe* for the sake of a bonnet, and with it go, as a rule, faith, honesty and female dignity. Still, let the French country girl turn out well and one cannot find a more thrifty, orderly housewife and clever business woman, nor a steadier, more earnest laborer than the French farmer who does not drink. Women, in the northern provinces especially, are more "courageous" at work, as the French say, than the men. In some parts of France they work in the fields like men. They share their husband's business or have some separate trade of their own.

In old times, a field laborer had little hopes of becoming rich, but nowadays young people often hear of some lucky chum who has turned up a trump in the city. They know there is no chance of finding in the fields a hen that lays golden eggs, so they never rest till they, too, get away. Some of these prodigals come home to die of broken health and spirits; many are never heard of again; a few return to live on their hardly earned savings and now and then to be supported by their "commune." It is a sad truth that the French peasant is changing into a hardened materialist. And it is by no means the Catholic cause I undertake to advocate. It is that of religion in the widest acceptation of the word. The Frenchman who gives up the faith of his fathers forfeits all faith, and consequently all moral restraint. It would be preferable to see him kneeling down every morning in the midst of his wheat fields tc adore the rising sun, or stealing into the dark oak forest to worship the pale sweet goddess of the night—believing in something, if naught but the immortality of his own soul—rather than to find him a prey to the hard egotism which is dragging him down to the earth that has borne him, without consolation in sorrow, or hope for the future.

LOLA DE SAN CARLOS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE USELESS HOUSE OF LORDS.

BY JUSTIN McCARTHY, M. P.

THE House of Lords is the champion anomaly of the British constitution. Now, I do not by any means propose to make myself responsible for the dogma that an anomalous institution can never render good service to a state. It is quite conceivable that some institution which had long outlived its original and habitual use might nevertheless at various periods of public crisis come to play an important and even a saving part in the affairs of the nation. But the peculiarity of the English House of Lords is that it could not now by any possibility play such a part. The day of its destiny is over; the star of its fate has declined.

In former times there was indeed a grandiose and high-sounding Tory doctrine about the mission of the House of Lords. The theory was that the House of Lords was an institution of something very like heavenly origin, the function of which was to step in between a blinded and maddened nation and that nation's self-destruction. The nation, let us assume, is going mad. Inflamed by the frantic and hyperbolical rhetoric of some wicked and self-seeking Liberal—some Fox, or Grey, or Bright, or Gladstone—the maddened nation is rushing on its own doom. It is clamoring for some insane project of law—a reduced franchise, for instance, a system of taking vote by ballot, a throwing-open of the national universities to all persons without distinction of creed, or any of those wild revolutionary schemes, the accomplishment of which, as is well known, brings states to their instant downfall. Very well. Now here, according to the ancient theory, comes in the mission of the House of Lords. The House of Commons has failed in its duty and has passed a measure to admit workingmen to the franchise, or to protect the voting citizen by the ballot, or to allow Roman Catholics and Dissenters to win all the university honors they can. The House of Commons has done this, and the nation is lost if the House of Lords

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not step in to save it. So the House of Lords steps in and saves. It rejects the popular measure which the House of Commons had passed—and behold a rescued state!

This was undoubtedly the ancient Conservative theory concerning the business of the House of Lords. But the theory has fallen into sad disrepute of late years even among the Tories. The House of Lords interfered to save the state from Lord Grey's Reform Bill, and it had to pass the bill all the same. The only difference was that the bill might have been passed quietly but for the House of Lords, whereas it was passed because the storm of popular indignation rose so high as to frighten the poor peers into abject submission. It will never, perhaps, be known with any precision how near, how very near, England may have come to a terrible revolution while the House of Lords was trying to resist the passing of the Reform Bill. Well, but if the House of Lords has to give way whenever the people loudly and firmly demand anything, what is the particular use of the House of Lords? The part of a savior of society is no doubt a very responsible and a very noble part; but of what possible advantage is a constituted savior of society who cannot save? Nobody believes any more that the Lords can prevent the passing of any popular measure.

The House of Commons is slow enough, in all conscience, about measures of reform. Its natural inclination is to postpone everything, if not, indeed, to oppose everything, in the way of reform. The majority of the House of Commons is composed of steady-going, respectable men without two ideas in their heads. They are inclined to think every man a fanatic or a bore who has ideas of his own on public questions, or, most often, a fanatic and a bore combined. But the majority of the House of Commons are practical men and are responsible to their constituents, and they very soon find it borne in upon them that their constituents are really in earnest about some particular measure, and are determined to have it passed into law.

The familiar idea that the House of Commons is a reforming institution of its own motion and its own purpose is quite a mistake. The House of Commons is not naturally disposed to disturb itself much about measures of reform.

What could the American public think of an institution that has resisted and delayed every great reform proposed by English statesmanship? For that is not an exaggerated description of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the career of the House of Lords. Every measure carried by the Commons to extend the franchise, to protect the humble voter in his discharge of his electoral duty, to make education national, to make the transfer of land free, to release the tenant from actual servitude to his landlord, to introduce peace into Ireland by any process less stupid and brutal than that of a new coercion bill,—every such measure has been resisted in the first instance by the House of Lords. The House of Lords is a chamber composed almost exclusively of one class—the landlord class. Writing in the ordinary way, and expecting to be understood by reasonable human beings, one would be fairly warranted in describing the House of Lords as exclusively made up out of the landlord class. But, to anticipate small criticism on my own side of the water, I shall describe it as almost thus composed. Then, being a house of landlords, they are naturally a house interested in the maintenance of an Established Church with its system of presentation to livings as part of a landlord's personal property. Now, land reforms, franchise reforms, educational reforms, and reforms abolishing class privileges of any kind, are the main objects of English Liberal legislation. Therefore we have a House of Lords, a permanent institution of the state, with a very large majority of Tories in it, and a majority of landlords so great as to be absolutely overwhelming and to leave the tiny non-landlord minority of no account at all,—we have that House of Lords set up as a permanent tribunal to revise and reject the measures of the representative chamber, the House of Commons. I have already admitted that the Lords always have to give in to the House of Commons in the end. But this very fact is only one other argument to show the absurdity of such an institution. If the House of Lords must knuckle down at last to the House of Commons, what becomes of the theory of a saving upper chamber.

But, although the House of Lords cannot finally resist or reject, it can delay, it can obstruct, it can annoy and even exasperate, it can tamper with and mutilate and spoil good measures, and so make necessary the introduction of supplementary measures to repair the harm the Lords have done. Let us take some illustrations of this faculty which it undoubtedly possesses. I begin with the action of the House of Lords in regard to Mr. Gladstone's measure for the repeal of the paper duty.

The paper duty was simply a tax upon education. The paper

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty made it practically impossible for a cheap and popular newspaper to exist in Great Britain and Ireland. The working classes and the poor were by its operation cut off from the sight of a daily paper, for the regular price of a daily paper then was sixpence. Two venturous papers were started at a penny each shortly before 1860, but it did not appear possible that, under the conditions, they could be maintained. Mr. Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1860, and he brought in a bill for the abolition of the duty on paper. The House of Lords threw out the bill. The country was immersed in some months of confusion, agitation, vexation. Lord Palmerston endeavored to make it easy for the House of Lords. Mr. Gladstone denounced their conduct with outspoken eloquence. Lord Palmerston had it quietly conveyed to the Lords that they must pass the bill next session. The story used to go—and even if it be not true, it is characteristic of public opinion concerning the man—that Palmerston sent a message to the leading peers to the effect that what they had done was a very good joke for once, but that it must not be repeated. It was not repeated. The Lords passed the measure quietly and tacitly in the very next session. Yet those who heard the debate in the House of Lords in the session of 1860, when the bill was rejected, who listened as I did to the impassioned rhetoric of the late Lord Derby and to the lofty argument of the venerable Lord Lyndhurst, would have thought that the whole fate of England as a state depended on her maintaining the duty on paper. What had happened between that time and the next session—a few months—to revolutionize the opinion of the House of Lords? Nothing; but they saw the country was not with them, and that even their best friend, Lord Palmerston, was not prepared to back them up. They delayed for a few months a measure of vast national importance; they exasperated many persons and classes in the country—and that was all. What a part for a savior of society to play!

Let us come down a few years later. In 1869 Mr. Gladstone, being then Prime Minister, at the head of a powerful majority, carried his measure for the disendowment and disestablishment of the Irish State Church. The House of Lords did not venture actually to resist it. But when the measure came before them in committee, they so handled it and hacked it that they were enabled to secure a great portion of the plunder for the benefit of the disestablished church and to dodge the nation out of a large

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of its national property. The Irish Church—that is to say, the ecclesiastical staff—was disestablished altogether, but not by any means disendowed. The measure failed for this very reason to give full satisfaction in Ireland. But Mr. Gladstone naturally thought that it was better for the moment to be content with having secured the principle of disestablishment, and so let the Lords give away at their own sweet will a good many handfuls of the national property of Ireland.

Again, when Mr. Gladstone's government introduced the bill for the abolition of the purchase of commissions in the army—a system for which the wit of man could invent no reasonable excuse—the House of Lords passed a resolution which would have practically defeated the measure of reform. Mr. Gladstone met this resistance by what I cannot help calling a political *coup d'état*. The system of purchase in the army was founded in old days by royal regulation. Mr. Gladstone advised the Queen to cancel the royal warrant which made the purchase of commissions legal. The Queen did so and the purchase system came to an end, and the House of Lords was left hopelessly in the lurch.

The measure introduced by Mr. Gladstone's government to establish the system of vote by ballot was rejected by the House of Lords on its first presentation, but it had to be accepted or swallowed by the peers in the very next session. It should be said that even in this second session the peers tried to spoil the measure and render it absolutely worthless as a protection to the voter. The House of Commons stood firm and the House of Lords had to give in. The measure to admit all lay students of whatever faith to the national universities on equal terms was carried by Mr. Gladstone in 1871, after a similar measure had been twice over carried by the House of Commons and twice over rejected by the House of Lords.

There is something provoking—I cannot find any better word to express what I mean—in the habitual policy of the House of Lords. It will pass anything the moment the country gets angry and makes a row. It will oppose or postpone, or mutilate or emasculate, any measure of genuine reform if it seems at all likely that such a course can be taken with impunity. Therefore one cannot even have the respect for the House of Lords which he might have for implacable and fearless fanaticism, or even implacable and fearless selfishness. The House of Lords will not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fight. It surrenders, but does not die. One session the peers through their majority give forth their *non possumus*. They cannot hear of the proposed change. Personal conscience and national honor alike forbid them. To pass such a bill would make them accomplices in the destruction of England's safety and England's glory. The voices of the past, the present, and the future alike forbid the House of Lords to sanction such legislation. The dead would arise from beneath their marble tombs and their monumental brasses to forbid such a sacrifice of all that English tradition holds most dear. So the heroic attitude is maintained for one session. Then the next session comes and the House of Lords will pass the very same bill without a murmur of serious dissent or objection—and will leave the illustrious dead to sleep beneath their marble tombs and their monumental brasses.

I firmly believe that the House of Lords is responsible directly for the worst disturbances that prevailed in Ireland during the years from 1881 to 1885. I think I can make my conviction clear and show that its reasons are good. Mr. Gladstone came back to power in the early part of 1880. He had been in opposition for six years. Every one on both sides of the House of Commons assumed that the first great and difficult subject he would attempt to deal with would be the Irish land system. He had begun to deal with this subject in 1870, but he had not made his measure of reform strong enough, or nearly strong enough, to cope with the difficulties of land-tenure reform. It was announced on his behalf that the government were determined to bring in a measure of a strong and comprehensive nature to deal with the land-tenure system of Ireland. But it was not possible to undertake the carrying of such a measure in an already shortened and overloaded session. The Irish National party admitted the difficulty, but asked the government to take in the meantime some steps to prevent the ruthless evictions.

The question of eviction was at the heart of the whole land controversy in Ireland. Shall the landlord, or shall he not, have the absolute right to turn the tenant out of the land which the tenant alone, utterly unhelped by the landlord, has converted from a worthless bog into a property? Shall the landlord have the absolute right to exact a regularly increasing rent from the tenant because of the increasing value of the land, when that increase of value is due altogether to the tenant's own energy and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

patience? If the tenant cannot pay the increased rent, shall the landlord have a right to turn him out and sell the product of his industry to another man? That was, in simple substance, the Irish land question. A bill was about to be introduced to give the Irish tenant for the first time the right to profit by his own industry. We asked the government not to allow the tenant to be swept off the land before the measure for his protection could be passed.

The government consented to our demand and brought in what was known as the Compensation-for-Disturbance Bill. The measure simply enacted that if a landlord chose to turn out a tenant he must at least repay him the value of any genuine improvements the tenant might have made in the land. This would be, in fact, to stop unjust eviction, for the landlords would not care to pay a money compensation however fairly earned. The government brought in their bill and succeeded in carrying it through the House of Commons. The House of Lords rejected it. A cry of despair went up from the Irish tenants. Even those who were well disposed to trust to Mr. Gladstone lost heart. "What is the good?" I heard many of them ask; "even if he really wishes to help us and to save us, the House of Lords won't let him." Then came violence and outrage, born of despair. I have never yet heard of any country in which despair did not lead to violence and to outrage. In the House of Commons, two years or more after that time, I myself described the action of the House of Lords in rejecting the Compensation-for-Disturbance Bill as the fountain and origin of all the troubles and the evils that followed; and I was glad to observe that Mr. Gladstone gave by voice and by gesture his most energetic assent to my declaration.

Of course Mr. Gladstone's Land Bill had to be passed in the end—and of course the end was not far off. It was passed in 1881. The Lords, as usual, had delayed wholesome legislation by one session only. But in this particular instance, as in some other instances, too, the delay interposed by the Lords brought on the country tumult and passion and despair, violence and the shedding of blood.

My short sketch of the manner in which the House of Lords dealt with the Irish land question at that time would be sadly incomplete if I did not add that the peers so mutilated some of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the clauses of Mr. Gladstone's Land Bill of 1881 as to make them utterly inoperative for the very objects to which they were intended to apply. The famous "Healy clause," for example, they cut and carved until it became a mere subject for vexatious legislation to prevent the tenant from obtaining his rights. It was a clause introduced for the tenant's protection. The House of Lords converted it into a mechanism for his further vexation.

I can imagine an American reader asking why any Liberal government allows the House of Lords to mutilate its good measures in this reckless and wholesale fashion? Why do not Liberal governments stand out and insist that measures which have been carried through the Commons shall not be mangled and spoiled in the House of Lords? The reason can be easily given, although I do not think the justification can be quite so easily found. Our over-incumbered system of legislation in our centralized Parliament at Westminster forces us to do everything in a hurry. We are always in a race against time. If a bill gets thrown out this session, it may be very hard, unless it is a measure of the most immediate importance, to find a place for it in the next session. Even if it is a measure of great importance, still there are various other measures of great importance waiting and pressing for their turn. Therefore the government will do almost anything for the sake of carrying the principle of a bill within the session during which it has been introduced.

The government, let us say, have brought in some measure to which they attach great importance and which has a distinct and a novel principle. Let it, for the sake of argument, be an Irish land bill. The measure, after much struggle, is carried intact through the House of Commons. By this time the session is far advanced. It goes up to the Lords, and the Lords, not daring to reject it, make such alterations in certain clauses as to render these clauses of no practical value. The bill comes down to the Commons again, and the Commons refuse to agree to the Lords' amendments. Then there are conferences between the two houses —and the time is running on. If an agreement cannot be found, the bill will have to stand over to another session. The government, therefore, feel driven to accept a compromise for the sake of affirming the principle of the measure; as was done in the case of the Irish Land Bill. The bill becomes law in its mutilated form and fails to give satisfaction, and has in course of time to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be restored to its original purpose by other acts of legislation. Time is lost, much difficulty is created, and great harm is done by the action of the House of Lords.

I think if I were a Liberal Prime Minister I would put my foot down, and refuse to allow any of my important measures to be tinkered and spoiled by the House of Lords. I think I would let the bill be postponed for once, and give the country clearly to understand why it was postponed. I would throw on the House of Lords the full responsibility for its postponement. A lesson of that kind would cure the House of Lords very soon of its passion for spoiling good measures.

Ireland has, of course, been always a happy hunting-ground for the House of Lords. It has been so much safer to spoil, or even altogether reject, a good bill for Ireland than to spoil or reject a good bill for England. Until within the last few years Ireland had hardly any strong friends in Parliament. The House of Lords might cut any capers it liked where merely Irish legislation was concerned. No outcry loud enough to reach the ears of the big British public could well be made over a rejected measure to improve the condition of the Irish laborers, or to establish in Ireland a satisfactory method for the registration of votes, or to amend the hideous defects and anomalies of the Irish grand-jury system. Therefore, the history of legislation records an unbroken succession of annual instances to show what the Lords have done with any and all attempts made by Irish members of Parliament to introduce domestic reforms into their own country.

There are reforms still unaccomplished for the Irish governing system which have been the subject of legislation during all the sessions of Parliament that I can remember. These measures were brought in every year as a matter of course—as a matter of duty. At first they were rejected by the majority in the House of Commons. Then, by iteration of fact and argument, they justified themselves and commended themselves, as every measure of genuine reform always does in the end, to the House of Commons—the representative assembly, which is compelled to be in touch with the nation. Then came another and a familiar stage in the movement. The measures accepted by the House of Commons were invariably rejected, year after year, by the House of Lords. Many of them remain in that position to this very day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They were not important enough, in the imperial sense, to arouse a national enthusiasm and to provoke by their rejection a national clamor, and the peers did not care three straws for any outcry made by the Irish people.

But the Irish people have gained what Wordsworth calls "great allies" in England. They have carried the best English statesmanship with them, and, better even than that, they have won to their side the whole liberalism and radicalism and democracy of Great Britain—their allies are the people of England and Scotland and Wales. And Ireland will soon be free to settle her domestic legislation for herself.

It may be asked whether, then, I see no countervailing advantage to the country in the existence of the House of Lords. Admitting all the defects, are there actually no advantages? I only give my own opinion, and I say, No—none whatever. I am not now discussing the wider question as to the value of a second chamber in the legislation of a state. I am thinking merely of the House of Lords in its present form, or in any form like to that; and I can only say that I see in its existence much evil to the national interests and no good: no—none whatever.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN BEHALF OF PARENTS.

BY AGNES REPPLIER.

It is a thankless task to be a parent in these exacting days, and I wonder now and then at the temerity which prompts man or woman to assume such hazardous duties. Time was, indeed, when parents lifted their heads loftily in the world; when they were held to be, in the main, useful and responsible persons; when their authority, if unheeded, was at least unquestioned; and when one of the ten commandments was considered to indicate that especial reverence was their due. These simple and primitive convictions lingered on so long that some of us can perhaps remember when they were a part of our youthful creed, and when, in life and in literature, the lesson commonly taught was that the province of the parent is to direct and control, the privilege of the child is to obey, and to be exempt from the painful sense of responsibility which overtakes him in later years. In very old-fashioned books this point of view is strained to embrace some rather difficult conclusions. The attitude of Evelina to her worthless father, of Clarissa Harlowe to her tyrannical parents, seemed right and reasonable to the generations which first read these novels, while we of the present day are amazed at such unnatural submissiveness and loyalty. "It is hard," says Clarissa's mother, in answer to her daughter's despairing appeals, "if a father and mother, and uncles and aunts, all conjoined, cannot be allowed to direct your choice;" an argument to which the unhappy victim replies only with her tears. How one longs to offer Mrs. Harlowe some of those little manuals of advice which prove to us now so conclusively that even a young child is deeply wronged by subjection. "Looked at from the highest standpoint," says one of our modern mentors, "we have no more right to interfere with individual choice in our children

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than we have to interfere with the choice of friends;" a statement which, applied as it is, not to marriageable young women, but to small boys and girls, defines matters explicitly, and does away at once and forever with all superannuated theories of obedience.

A short perusal of these text-books of training would lead the uninitiated to conclude that the children of to-day are a down-trodden race, deprived of their natural rights by the ruthless despotism of parents. It is also indicated with painful and humiliating distinctness that adults have no rights—at least none that children are bound to respect—and that we have hardened ourselves into selfishness by looking at things from a grown-up, and consequently erroneous, point of view. For example, to many of us it is an annoyance when a child wantonly destroys our property. This is ungenerous. "With anointed eyes we might often see in such a tendency a great power of analysis, that needs only to be understood to secure grand results;"—which reflection should make us prompt to welcome the somewhat disastrous results already secured. I once knew a little boy who, having been taken on a visit to some relatives, succeeded within half-an-hour in purloining the pendulums of three old family clocks, a passion for analysis which ought to have made him one of the first mechanics of his age, had not his genius, like that of the political agitator, stopped short at the portals of reconstruction.

It is hard to attune our minds to a correct appreciation of such incidents, when the clocks belong to us, and the child doesn't. It is hard to be told that our pendulums are a necessary element, which we do wrong to begrudge, in the training of a boy's observation. All modern writers upon children unite in denouncing the word "don't," as implying upon every occasion a censure which is often unmerited. But this protest reminds me of the little girl who, being told by her father she must not say "I won't," innocently inquired: "But, papa, what am I to say when I mean 'I won't'"? In the same spirit of uncertainty I would like to know what I am to say when I mean "don't." Auretta Roys Aldrich, who has written a book on *Children—Their Models and Critics*, in which she is rather severe upon adults, tells us a harrowing tale of a mother and a five-year-old boy, who sat near her one day on a railway train. The child thrust his head out of the window, whereupon the mother

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said tersely: "Johnnie, stop putting your head out of the window!" That was all. No word of explanation or entreaty softened this ruthless command. Whether Johnnie obeyed or not is unrevealed, being a matter of no importance, but, "as they left the car," comments the author, "they left also an aching in my heart. I longed to clasp the mother in my arms, for she, too, had been the victim of misunderstanding, and show her, before it was too late, how she was missing the pure gold of life for herself and her little boy." Happily, before long, another mother entered, and her child also put his head as far as he could out of that troublesome window, which nobody seemed to have the sense to shut. Observing this, his wise parent sat down by his side, "made some pleasant remark about the outlook," and then gradually and persuasively revealed to him his danger, discussing the matter with "much candor and interest," until he was finally won over to her point of view, and consented of his own free will, and as a rational human being, to draw in his little head.

I think this double experience worth repeating, because it contrasts so pleasantly with the venerable anecdote which found its way into all the reading books when I was a small child, and illustrated the then popular theory of education. It was the story of a mother who sees her boy running rapidly down a steep hill, and knows that, almost at his feet, lies an abandoned quarry, half hidden by underbrush and weeds. Sure of his obedience, she calls sharply, "Stop, Willie!" and the child, with a violent effort, stays his steps at the very mouth of the pit. Had it been necessary to convince him first that her apprehensions were well-grounded, he would have broken his neck meanwhile, and our school books would have had one tale less to tell.

Still more astounding to the uninitiated is another little narrative told with enviable gravity by Mrs. Aldrich, and designed to show how easily and deeply we wound a child's inborn sense of justice. "A beautiful boy of four whose parents were unusually wise in dealing with him"—it is seldom that a parent wins this degree of approbation—possessed a wheel-barrow of his own, in which he carried the letters daily to and from the post-office. One morning he was tardy in returning, "for there was the world to be explored" on the way; and his mother, growing anxious, or perhaps desiring her mail, followed him to know what was the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matter. She met him at the post-office door, and seeing in the barrow an envelope directed to herself, she rashly picked it up and opened it. Edwin promptly "raised a vehement cry of protest." That letter, like all the rest, had been given to him to carry, and no one else was privileged to touch it. Swiftly and repentantly his mother returned the unfortunate missive, but in vain. "The wound was too deep, and he continued to cry 'Mamma, you ought not to have done it!' over and over again between his sobs." In fact he "refused to be comforted,"—comforted!—"and so was taken home as best he could be, and laid tenderly and lovingly in bed. After sleeping away *the sharpness of sorrow and disappointment,* and consequent exhaustion, the matter could be talked over; but while he was so tired, and keenly smarting under the sense of injustice done him, every word added fuel to the flame. . . . *His possessions had been taken away from him by sheer force, before which he was helpless.* That his indignation was not appeased by putting the letter back into his keeping showed that he was contending for a principle, and not for possession or any selfish interest."

Readers of George Eliot may be pleasantly reminded of that scene in *The Mill on the Floss* where Tom Tulliver unthinkingly withdraws a rattle with which he has been amusing baby Moss, "whereupon she, being a baby that knew her own mind with remarkable clearness, instantaneously expressed her sentiments in a piercing yell, and was not to be appeased even by the restoration of the rattle, feeling apparently that the original wrong of having it taken away from her remained in all its force." But to some of us the anecdote of Edwin and his wheel-barrow is more disheartening than droll. The revelation of such admirable motives underlying such inexcusable behavior puzzles and alarms us. If this four-year-old prig "contending for a principle and not for possession" be a real boy, what has become of all the dear, naughty, fighting, obstinate, self-willed, precious children whom we used to know; the children who contended joyously, not for principle, but for precedence, and to whom we could say "don't" a dozen times a day with ample justification. Little boys ought to be the most delightful things in the world, with the exception of little girls. It is as easy to love them when they are bad as to tolerate them when they are good. But what can we do with conscientious infants to whom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

misbehavior is a moral obligation, and who scream in the public streets from an exalted sense of justice.

Mrs. Kate Douglas Wiggin, that ardent champion of Froebel, has also given to the world a book bearing the somewhat ominous title, *Children's Rights*, but which is for the most part as interesting as it is sane. Setting aside the question of kindergartens, concerning which there are at present many conflicting opinions, it is impossible not to agree with Mrs. Wiggin in much that she states so deftly, and maintains so vivaciously. There is little doubt that the rights of the parent do infringe occasionally on the rights of the child, and that, in the absence of any standard, the child becomes a creature of circumstance. He can be fed unwholesomely, kept up late at night, dressed like Lord Fauntleroy, dosed with pernicious drugs, and humored into selfish petulance at the discretion of his mother. Worse still, he can be suffered to waste away in fever pain and die, because his parents chance to be fanatics who reject the aid of medicines to trust exclusively in prayer. But granting all this, fathers and mothers have still their places in the world, and until we can fill these places with something better, it is worth while to call attention now and then to the useful part they play. It is perhaps a significant fact that mothers, simply because they are mothers, succeed better, as a rule, in bringing up their children than other women, equally loving and sensible, who are compelled to assume their duties. That old-fashioned plea "I know what is best for my child" may be derided as a relic of darkness; but there is an illuminating background to its gloom. I am not even sure that parents stand in absolute need of all the good advice they receive. I am quite sure that many trifles are not worth the serious counsels expended upon them. Reading or telling a story, for instance, has become as grave a matter as choosing a laureate, and many a mother must stand aghast at the conflicting admonitions bestowed upon her: Read fairy tales. Don't read fairy tales. Read about elves. Don't read about ogres. Read of heroic deeds. Don't read of bloody battles. Avoid too much instruction. Be as subtly instructive as you can. Make your stories long. Make your stories short. Work the moral in. Leave the moral out. Try and please the older children. Try and charm the younger ones. Study the tastes of boys. Follow the fancies of girls. By degrees the harassed parent who endeavors to obey these instruc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions will cease telling stories at all, confident that the task, which once seemed so simple and easy, must lie far beyond her limited intelligence.

All that Mrs. Wiggin has to say about children's books and playthings is both opportune and true. I wish indeed she would not speak of restoring toys "to their place in education," which has a dismal sound, though she does not mean it to be taken dismally. Toys are toys to her, not traps to erudition, and the costly inanities of our modern nurseries fill her with well-warranted aversion. We are doing our best to stunt the imaginations of children by over-loading them with illustrated story-books and elaborate playthings. Little John Ruskin, whose sole earthly possessions were a cart, a ball, and two boxes of wooden bricks, was infinitely better off than the small boy of to-day whose real engine drags a train of real cars over a miniature elevated railway, almost as ghastly as reality, and whose well-dressed soldiers can't fight until they are wound up with a key. "The law was that I should find my own amusement," says Ruskin, and he found it readily enough in the untrammelled use of his observation, his intelligence, and his fancy. I have known children to whom a dozen spools had a dozen distinct individualities; soldiers, priests, nuns and prisoners of war; and to whom every chair in the nursery was a well-tried steed, familiar alike with the race-course and the Holy Land, having its own name, and requiring to be carefully stabled at night after the heroic exertions of the day. The romances and dramas of infancy need no more setting than a Chinese play, and in that limitless dreamland the transformations are as easy as they are brilliant. But no child can successfully "make believe," when he is encumbered on every side by mechanical toys so odiously complete that they leave nothing for the imagination to supply.

In the matter of books, Mrs. Wiggin displays the same admirable conservatism, her modern instincts being checked and held in sway by the recollection of those few dear old volumes which little girls used to read over and over again, until they knew them by heart. Yet I hardly think that "naughty" is a kind word to apply to Miss Edgeworth's Rosamond, who is not very wise, I admit, and under no circumstances a prig, but always docile and charming and good. And why should the "red morocco housewife," which Rosamond, in one of her rare mo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments of discretion, chooses instead of a stone plum, be stigmatized as "hideous but useful." It may have been an exceedingly neat and pretty possession. We are told nothing to the contrary, and I had a brown one stamped with gold when I was a little girl, which, to my infant eyes, represented supreme artistic excellence. It also hurts my feelings very much to hear Casabianca dubbed an "inspired idiot," who lacked the sense to escape. Unless the Roman sentries found dead at their posts in Pompeii were also inspired idiots, there should be some kinder word for the blind heroism which subordinates reason to obedience. And I am by no means sure that this form of relentless nineteenth-century criticism does not do more to vulgarize a child's mind by destroying his simple ideals than do the frank old games which Mrs. Wiggin considers so boorish, and which fill her with "unspeakable shrinking and moral disgust." The coarseness of "Here come two ducks a-roving," which was once the blithest of pastorals, and of that curious relic of antiquity, "Green Gravel," is not of a hurtful kind, and some of these plays have a keen attraction for highly imaginative children. For my part, I do not believe that all the kindergarten games in Christendom, all the gentle joy of pretending you were a swallow and had your little baby swallows cuddled under your wing, can compare for an instant with the lost delight of playing "London Bridge" in the dusk of a summer evening, or in the dimly-lit schoolroom at bedtime. There was a mysterious fascination in the words whose meaning no one understood, and no one sought to understand:

> **"Here comes a candle to light you to bed,**
> **And here comes a hatchet to cut off your head."**

And then the sudden grasp of four strong little arms, and a pleasing thrill of terror at a danger which was no danger—only a shadow and a remembrance of some dim horror in the past, living for generations in the unbroken traditions of play.

I have wandered unduly from the wrongs of parents to the rights of children, an easy and agreeable step to take. But the children have many powerful advocates, and need no help from me. The parents stand undefended, and suffer grievous things in the way of counsel and reproach. It must surprise some of them occasionally to be warned so often against undue severity. It must amaze them to hear that their lazy little boys and girls

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are suffering from overwork, and in danger of mental exhaustion. It must amuse them—if they have any sense of humor—to be told in the columns of a weekly paper "How to Reprove a Child," just as they are told "How to Make an Apple Pudding," and "How to Remove Grease Spots from Clothing." As for the discipline of the nursery, that has become a matter of supreme importance to all whom it does not concern, and the suggestions offered, the methods urged, are so varied and conflicting that the modern mother can be sure of one thing only—all that she does is wrong. The most popular theory appears to be that whenever a child is naughty it is his parent's fault, and she owes him prompt atonement for his misbehavior. "We should be astonished, if not appalled," says Mrs. Aldrich, "if we could see in figures the number of times the average child is unnecessarily censured during the first seven years of life." Punishment is altogether out of favor. Its apparent necessity arises from the ill-judged course of the father or mother in refusing to a child control over his own actions. This doctrine was expounded to us some years ago by Helen Hunt, who reasoned wisely that "needless denials" were responsible for most youthful naughtiness, and who was probably right. It would not perhaps be too much to say that if we could have what we wanted and do what we wanted all through life, we should, even as adults, be saved from a great deal of fretfulness and bad behavior.

Miss Nora Smith, who is Mrs. Wiggin's clever collaborateur, allows, however, what she terms "natural punishment," or "natural retribution," which appears to be something like the far-famed justice of the Mikado, and is represented as being absolutely satisfactory to the child. This is a gain over the old methods which the child, as a rule, disliked; and it is also a gain over the long-drawn tests so urgently commended by Helen Hunt, whose model mother shut herself up for two whole days with her four-year-old boy, until she succeeded, by moral suasion, in inducing him to say G. During these two days the model mother's equally model husband was content to eat his meals alone, and to spend his evenings in solitude, unless he went to his club, and all her social and domestic duties were cheerfully abandoned. Her principle was not to enforce obedience, but to persuade the child to overcome his own reluctance, to conquer his own will. With this view she pretended for forty-eight hours that he could not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pronounce the letter, and that she was there to help him to do it. The boy, baby though he was, knew better. He knew he was simply obstinate, and, with the delicious clear-sightedness of children, which ought to put all sentimental theorists to shame, he actually proposed to his parent that she should shut him in a closet and see if that would not "make him good!" Of course the unhallowed suggestion was not adopted; but what a tale it tells of childish acumen, and of that humorous grasp of a situation which is the endowment of infancy. The dear little sensible, open-eyed creatures! See them dealing out swift justice to their erring dolls, and you will learn their views upon the subject of retribution. I once knew a father who defended himself for frequently thrashing an only and idolized son—who amply merited each chastisement—by saying that Jack would think him an idiot if he didn't. That father was lamentably ignorant of much that it behooves a father now to acquire. He had probably never read a single book designed for the instruction and humiliation of parents. He was in a state of barbaric darkness concerning the latest theories of education. But he knew one thing perfectly, and that one thing, says Sir Francis Doyle, is slipping fast from the minds of men; namely, "The intention of the Almighty that there should exist for a certain time between childhood and manhood, the natural production known as a boy."

AGNES REPPLIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ISSUE OF THE GERMAN ELECTIONS.

BY DR. JOSEPH H. SENNER, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Duo quum faciunt idem, non est idem,—the same thing done by two persons is not the same thing. Bismarck dissolved the Reichstag but twice, first in the eleventh, secondly in the twentieth year of his régime as Chancellor. Caprivi was but at the beginning of the fourth year of his Chancellorship when he was forced to take the extraordinary step, that *ultima ratio* of a more or less constitutional modern State,—dissolution of Parliament. Bismarck, the Thunderer, acted on both occasions in his true lightning style—in 1878, when the Reichstag refused to pass the law against the Socialists, and in 1887 when the same majority of the Imperial Parliament, half liberal and half clerical, made provision for the military *état* for but three years, instead of for the seven years demanded. In his significant, resolute way Bismarck abruptly sent the self-styled representatives of the people home, at once entered upon a vigorous campaign, and succeeded each time in carrying out his wishes, by overwhelming majorities, within a few weeks after the opening of the new Reichstag. Emperor William II., who wanted to be his own Chancellor, and the well-disciplined, distinguished soldier whom he had detailed to the highest executive office of his Empire, wasted many months in futile bargaining for a majority, until at last a hostile decisive vote and the ensuing dissolution were rather enforced against their will. The electoral campaign then conducted was awkward, lifeless and inefficient, and resulted, as shown below, in the signal defeat of the government's plan. The difference between the Bismarckian statecraft and that of the New Era is marked. And yet precisely the same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leading idea guided the actions of both; the same thing was done by the old and by the new Chancellor.

All who could read the signs of the times knew, or at least might have known, that the hour for a new election was as ill-chosen as was the issue of the government's campaign. No more unpopular issue could be presented to the German people than an increase of the military burdens; and perhaps the most unpropitious time during the last decade for forcing that issue was the spring of 1893. The first septennate fixed the peace strength of the Army, for the years 1874-1881, at 401,659 privates and subalterns; the second (1881-1888), at 427,000; and the third (1887-1894), initiated by Bismarck before the expiration of the second, originally at 468,409, but that number was increased, in 1890, by amendment, to 486,983. Two years later Chancellor Caprivi, who had in 1890 solemnly affirmed the impracticability of a further increase, demanded that the fourth septennate, or rather quinquennate (October, 1893—March, 1899), be fixed at no less than 570,877 men yearly,—despite the fact that the Reichstag in 1890 granted the government's request only with the proviso, insisted upon by the famous Windthorst, that in future the peace strength as well as the expenditures for military purposes would be materially reduced. After that time the ordinary expenditures of the Empire, aside from the Army, were considerably increased, resulting in a large and serious addition to its federal debt, while the revenues from customs duties were cut down not a little by the commercial treaties of December, 1891. The net yearly expenditures for the army, subsequent to 1879, increased from 361 to 535 million marks, and the Federal debt, during the same period, rose from 139 to 1,755 million marks, with annual interest charges of 9,000,000 and 66,000,000 marks, respectively. How in the world, under such circumstances, could a further increase in the yearly expenditures of more than 60 millions (without counting the so-called extraordinary expenditures of more than 100 millions which were in fact moneys invested in the added armament) have been thought of as a popular issue?

The Germans are patriotic. They are proud, and justly so, of the grand achievements of the old Emperor and his great Chancellor. In fact, Monsieur Chauvin, in the Fatherland as well as in France, has only too prolific an offspring willing to sacrifice important rights and liberties to the delusive glory of military

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supremacy. But the people of the Fatherland, though valiant in war, are quite prone to economy in time of peace, and the greatest exponent of the German spirit, Prince Bismarck, was himself well aware that the renowned *furor teutonicus* must first be aroused. Now, the prospect of continued peace was certainly better at the time of the introduction and discussion of Caprivi's oppressively burdensome army bill than it had been for years. In France, Germany's traditional arch-enemy, the party of peace and order were seemingly in full power, and the Panama affair was claiming all of the nation's attention. Czar Alexander had apparently forsaken his ancient grudges, the product in his mind of the treacherous ingratitude of the Hohenzollerns and the crafty ambiguity of the House of Hapsburg. And even if excitable France should again suddenly become an easy prey to declamatory, heaven-aspiring revolutionists and ambitious, pompously-mounted generals, or if greedy Russia, flushed with self-confidence upon the completion of her great re-armament of deadly repeating rifles, should precipitately throw off the artful mask of self-restraint, of what avail was a plan of army re-organization, the effects of which could not be fully realized for ten or, perhaps, fifteen years? Hence, while the political optimists were able easily to ridicule the bugbear of a great war with two fronts, the pessimists might, with at least as much reason, reject as impracticable any scheme of thorough re-organization of the army in the face of menacing foes.

Then why, it may be asked, did William II. select that unfortunate issue? Young, energetic and self-confident as the Emperor is, no one will attribute to him such lack of intelligence as failure to understand the weakness and inconsistency of the arguments advanced, in behalf of an *Armeevorlage*, at that time, by the most eloquent orators and the most brilliant writers whom he could enlist in his service. And the Chancellor, though by no means a genius of the Bismarck type, should not be underrated, for many tests have shown him to be a general of excellent abilities and a statesman of more than average judgment. Neither Emperor William, nor Chancellor Caprivi, without apparent injustice to their sagacity, can be supposed to have entirely overlooked the unavoidable effects of such a military bill, its public discussion during no less than nine months, the wavering position of the government, the refusal by the latter to accept any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measure of compromise proposed by the Liberals, the final though overdue acceptance of such a measure when offered by an ultramontane aristocrat, the surprising rejection of the bill and of all compromise by a large majority, and the consequent dissolution of the Reichstag. Undoubtedly Germany's ruler was fully aware, in accord with public opinion, that a decisive governmental majority, if any, was not to be expected as the result of the approaching election, and that the campaign must necessarily lead to an augmentation of the socialistic vote and of its so-called conservative pendant, anti-semitism. Why then, it will be asked again, did William II. pursue such a course? To one well versed in German and Prussian history and their constitutions the answer is so obvious that I am surprised that the daily press seem to have missed it.

On paper both Prussia and Germany possess constitutions and enjoy, nominally, constitutional government. There is, indeed, a Prussian as well as a German Parliament. But no greater mistake could be made than to liken those constitutions and Parliaments to those of Great Britain. To perceive this clearly it is necessary but to recall the royal decree of January 4, 1882, evidently formulated by Bismarck:

"The right of the King to direct the government and the politics of Prussia, according to *His own will* has been restricted, by no means abrogated, by the Constitution. . . . The Prussian Constitution is but the expression of the monarchical traditions of the country, whose development is based on the eternal relations between the King and His people. . . . It is, therefore, My will, that both in Prussia *and in the legislative bodies of the Empire* no doubt shall be left about My, and My successors', constitutional right to *personally direct the policy of My government.*"

Bismarck once said, in a speech before Parliament, in his picturesque style of oratory:

"Prussian royalty has not yet fulfilled its mission; it is not yet ripe to be a purely ornamental decoration of the constitutional structure; it is not yet ripe to be inserted as a dead piece of machinery into the mechanism of parliamentary goverment."

Emperor William II., though he dismissed the teacher, is a true disciple of the Bismarckian doctrine. Even more than his illustrious grandfather, and certainly much more than his good father, young William II. is not satisfied to reign; he wants to govern, and in a manner and to a degree unthought of by any Prussian monarch since the inauguration of the constitution. With him it is not alone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a "constitutional right personally to direct the policy of His government," but first of all the divine prerogative of a king by the grace of God. He was in dead earnest when he resurrected the obsolete motto of Roman Cæsars : *Sic volo, sic jubeo ; sit pro ratione voluntas* (So I will, so I command ; My will takes the place of reasons). He revealed his inmost mind when he emphatically declared not long ago that he never could agree with people who responded to his command with a "Yes, but!" and that all he wanted was "Yes, so then!" His conception of loyalty may be measured by his appeal to his Brandenburgers to follow their Margrave blindly through thick and thin. His soul is filled with the ideals of a soldier, and it is but natural that he is extremely sensitive not only to the threatened loss of military supremacy for Germany but, perhaps even more, to the growing difficulty of finding a subservient Parliament.

And this difficulty is growing, rapidly and alarmingly. The spirit of the German, wherever found, is naturally independent. He bowed to the overawing genius and almost superhuman energy of Bismarck, though with great reluctance, gnashing of teeth and restiveness. But once liberated from the incubus, the old Germanic spirit of independence re-asserted itself, much to the surprise and chagrin of the young ruler in the so-called New Era. The Emperor in vain attempted to decoy one faction after the other. He abolished the severe anti-Socialistic law and tried to cajole the "little man"; he flattered the Poles and conceded to them some valuable rights ; he gave to the Liberals commercial treaties, and tried, but lamentably failed, to give to the Prussian Conservatives a school-law to satisfy their dearest wishes ; he delivered the Guelph treasure of 48 millions to the heirs of the dethroned King, and 16 millions of confiscated property to the Catholic clergy, and so on. But all in vain. A concession made to one faction served only to whet its appetite and to arouse the jealousy of all the other factions. The spirit of dissatisfaction grew and had as its basis the general desire to insist upon the people's right of self-government independent of the fluctuating wishes or whims of the ruler.

After all his small devices had been exhausted there remained but one issue on which the Emperor could hope to unite several factions in support of the government. Since the day of Sadowa that issue had never failed in the Old (Bismarckian) Era. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was but one possibility of breaking the spirit of parliamentary independence, and that was by means of a new army bill appealing to the needs of self-protection and to the patriotic desire of preserving the achievements of bloody wars. Even though a new election might increase the votes of socialistic and anti-semitic peace-breakers, that, it was believed, should make the friends of law and order more desirous of a strong government. The fact that the proposal to increase the army coincided with the personal desires of the Emperor but strengthened the unfortunate line of arguments which led to the introduction of Caprivi's bill and its portentous consequences.

But the people of Germany did not accept the issue presented to them by an ill-advised and short-sighted government, and that is the key to the situation. The electoral battle was actually fought and decided on the issue of *Parliamentary* (*i. e., People's*) *rule against Emperor's rule*, and it was certainly not the latter which came forth with flying colors. The rulers of the New Era have ignominiously lost this battle. The defeat of the Emperor's *voluntas* is the one overshadowing result of the recent German elections. It marks an important phase, possibly the turning point, of the great struggle of the German nation for real constitutional government. In comparison with the paramount importance of this one result even the most interesting details of the election dwindle to the level of mere incidents. The apparent annihilation of the Richterites, the dismal failure of the government to disrupt the mighty party of the Centre, the growth of socialistic and anti-semitic votes, the strength developed by the Poles, the weakness of the Alsatian protest party, the defeat of the free-traders and the increasing contrast between North and South Germany, all these and other favorite topics of the daily press are simply products of temporary coincidences. The effects will not last long. But the victory of the people's right to assert their will in the policy of the government will and cannot fail to impress the future development of the German nation.

JOSEPH H. SENNER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMING EXTRA SESSION.

I.—A DEMOCRATIC VIEW.*

BY SENATOR G. G. VEST, OF MISSOURI.

THE President's proclamation calling Congress together in extraordinary session on August 7 has caused much inquiry and discussion.

Action upon tariff revision will necessarily be delayed by the Constitutional requirement that all bills for raising revenue must originate in the House of Representatives, and some time must be consumed in formulating the details of such legislation.

It is certain that the financial situation will first receive the

* Since preparing the foregoing article the mints of India have been closed to the free coinage of silver by private owners. The fall in the price of silver changes, of course, the figures given in the article, but the argument for free coinage with a change of ratio is not affected. At the same time, the action of Great Britain places the question of mono-metallism or bi-metallism distinctly and sharply before Congress for its determination.

It is now boldly proclaimed by mono-metallists that silver is doomed as a money-metal, and that the United States must come at once to the gold standard.

While the action of Great Britain has unquestionably damaged bi-metallism and caused a heavy decline in the price of silver, it by no means follows that bi-metallism is doomed or that this country is ready for mono-metallism.

The fall in the price of silver to sixty-two cents an ounce was the result of panic and of the sensational falsehood that silver had been entirely demonetized in India. The British Government has great power, and is devoted to the gold standard, but it could not successfully demonetize silver in the Indian Empire, nor would its statesmen contemplate a measure so ruinous. They have simply closed the mints of India to coinage by private citizens, reserving to the government a monopoly of silver coinage.

There may be a permanent fall in the price of silver, and this fact would necessitate a greater ratio; but the question still remains whether we shall have mono-metallism or bi-metallism in the United States.

The Sherman act will be repealed; but if this cannot be accomplished at once the result must be largely attributed to the mono-metallists, who now openly assert, in the face of the Constitution, the established policy of our Government since its foundation, and the solemn declarations of both the Republican and Democratic parties, that silver must be abandoned as a money metal. These ill-timed enthusiasts have stripped all concealment from the question, and have made certain, what has been long suspected, the design to make gold the only standard of value in this country.

It will be found when Congress assembles that the repeal of the Sherman act cannot be made a stalking-horse for mono-metallism.

G. G. V.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attention of Congress. The uneasy and distrustful feeling which prevades all classes and the want of confidence in existing and proposed investments require immediate consideration in order that a remedy may be found for the abnormal and threatening conditions confronting a people whose unequalled resources should make them strangers to financial disaster.

As a matter of course there will be much eloquence expended in diagnosing the disease and ascertaining its origin, but recent declarations by the fathers of the Sherman Act would seem to make prolonged inquiry unnecessary. They are vehemently bastardizing their own offspring, and the unanimity with which they assert that it never received their approval, even when they voted for it, causes honest and patriotic citizens unacquainted with the intricacies of legislation to wonder how a measure which had the approval of nobody could have become the law.

Some little light is thrown upon the matter by ex-Senator Edmunds, who says in a recent interview that the Republican party was "between the devil and the deep sea," and embraced the devil of Shermanism to escape the deep sea of free coinage. This is simply an attempt to gloss over the notorious fact that the Republican leaders advocated and voted for a bill which they believed to be wrong, and now denounce as the cause of our present financial troubles, in order to hold the silver-producing States in the Republican column.

The Sherman Act was passed by the Republicans against the solid Democratic opposition, and if a remedy cannot be found at the coming session for its malign effects the responsibility justly rests upon those who sacrificed their convictions of right to partisan expediency. They preferred the enactment of a bad law to having President Harrison confronted with the necessity of vetoing a free coinage bill, and the consequent loss of California, Oregon, Nevada and Colorado to their party.

The Sherman Act, spawned by political exigency in the womb of a party caucus, ought to be repealed. It degrades silver by making it a commodity to be stored in the Treasury warehouse, without coinage, until enormous accumulation constitutes a standing menace to bi-metallism throughout the world.

The birth of this distorted and disowned monstrosity was accompanied, however, by the repeal of the Bland-Allison law, and those Senators and Members of the House who believe there is not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough gold to perform the functions of metallic money, and who construe the Constitution to mean that gold *and* silver shall both be used as full money metals, will never consent to the repeal of the Sherman Act without other legislation guaranteeing bi-metallism. They recognize the truth that the real conflict is between mono-metallism and bi-metallism, and that to give silver up to the tender mercies of the men who now urge the unconditional repeal of the Sherman Act would be surrendering the lamb to a wolf whose ravenous caress means certain death.

The friends of silver have no hope that free and unlimited coinage at the present ratio can be had during the administration of Mr. Cleveland. They supported him for the Presidency knowing his position; for they had no hesitation in choosing between Cleveland and Harrison, when they agreed with the former on every issue except free coinage, while they agreed with the latter upon nothing. It is certain that the President would veto a bill providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the present ratio, and that the measure could not be passed over his veto. It is also certain that the Sherman Act cannot be repealed absolutely and unconditionally, notwithstanding the prophecies so lavishly made by those who hope for a different result.

The silver question must be settled by repealing the Sherman Act and reënacting the Bland-Allison law, or by repealing the Sherman Act and changing the legal ratio between gold and silver with free and unlimited coinage for silver.

The Bland-Allison law was the product of "the-devil-and-the-deep-sea" expediency which brought forth the Sherman Act. It was passed by the Senate as a substitute for the House bill which provided for the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and like all makeshifts it has never had any real friends among either mono-metallists or bi-metallists.

On the other hand, the increase of the legal ratio between the two metals with free and unlimited coinage for silver furnishes the solution which meets to a large degree all conflicting opinions. It retains silver as a money metal and simply recognizes the fact that gold has increased in value since the present ratio was established.

Under existing law sixteen ounces of pure silver are declared equal to one ounce of pure gold; but in market overt it requires twenty-four and four-tenths ounces of silver to purchase an ounce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of gold. If the ratio should be increased to twenty-four for one the gold value of an ounce of pure silver would be 0.8613 instead of 1.2919 as at the present ratio. At twenty-three to one it would be 0.8987; at twenty-two to one, 0.9396; at twenty-one to one, 0.9843; at twenty to one, 1.0335.

It is possible that a majority of Congress will determine to change the ratio as has been done before by that body, and in view of the fact that free and unlimited coinage of silver must increase its commercial value the ratio of twenty to one may as a tentative proposition be fixed upon until actual experiment shall show that this ratio will not restore commercial parity.

It goes without saying that vigorous opposition will be made to this, as to any other compromise. The extremists who are determined to have free coinage at the present ratio, and the gold mono-metallists will unite in deprecating the enormous size of the silver dollar under the increased ratio, ignoring the fact that paper certificates can be used to represent the silver dollar of the future, and that the coinage of subsidiary silver can be increased with full legal-tender quality as under the Act of 1834.

One objection persistently urged by the enemies of silver will certainly be eliminated from the discussion by an increase of ratio. Foreign silver, including the mythical pots and pans of Senator Sherman, will not be brought to our mints at a loss of thirty cents an ounce besides the cost of transportation.

Whatever may be the result as to silver, it can be safely assumed that Congress will at its next session repeal those provisions of the McKinley tariff which increase the cost of necessaries and impose unjust taxes upon the consumer. This does not mean, as the advocates of the present law assert, that a cavalry charge will be made upon all protected interests, resulting in bankruptcy of manufacturers and the general reduction of wages; but it does mean that the existing system of tariff taxation, which makes a favored class partners with the government and creates trusts and monopolies, shall come to an end. The Democratic party is not controlled by anarchists nor socialists, and is as conservative and patriotic as its opponents, but it will proceed firmly yet cautiously to redeem the pledges for tariff reform which caused the overwhelming political triumph of last November.

Assailed by mercenary and unscrupulous adversaries, who are maddened by the loss of political power, and the prospective dim-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inution of exorbitant profits, the dominant party has before it the difficult task of reducing the taxation imposed on consumers by the McKinley tariff, without injuring the legitimate interests of either the manufacturer or wage-earner.

Whatever else may happen, it can be safely predicted that the import duties on raw materials for manufacture will be removed, and that coffee, tea and raw sugar will remain upon the free list. If, after repealing the provisions of the McKinley Act which give a bounty to sugar producers, and those which increase the duties upon clothing, hardware and other necessaries, there must be raised a large amount to defray governmental expenses, resort can be had to an increased tax upon whiskey and malt liquors, or to an income and succession tax.

That there will be stubborn and protracted opposition to the latter expedient, especially from the Northeastern States, cannot be doubted, but it is probable that debate and inquiry would strengthen the proposition. The opponents of an income tax habitually use the arguments that it is class legislation, productive of fraud and perjury, and that the law of 1863 was a failure. The first objection applies to all internal-revenue taxes, and to our entire National and State system of taxation. Special taxes are imposed by the United States and every State, and exemptions from taxation exist by Congressional and State legislation.

That fraud and perjury will attempt to avoid the tax is only stating what is an incident to all taxation, and it is a singular fact that this argument comes most frequently from those who systematically avoid the taxes upon their bonds and other securities, leaving the burthen of supporting the State and municipal governments to the unfortunate land-owner.

The income tax imposed by the Act of 1863, which continued until 1871, although collected during an era of loose administration and great disorder, placed in the Federal Treasury $363,000,000, or an average of $40,375,000 annually; and it is certain that with better methods of collection and the increase of wealth a much larger sum would be added to our revenues.

That it is a just tax based upon the fundamental equity that all property should contribute equally to the support of the government in return for the protection it receives was demonstrated by Sir Robert Peel years ago, and his argument has never been answered.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is strange that those who defend the McKinley law, which taxes the poor man upon the clothes he wears more than is paid in import duties by the multi-millionaire, should find their acute sense of justice lacerated and bruised by a tax that makes the incomes from secreted bonds and mortgages bear a just proportion of the expense necessary to protect them in peace and war.

There are other important questions for the consideration of Congress at its next session, but around finances and tariff reform will ebb and flow the tide of parliamentary battle.

No one can exaggerate the importance of the coming session, for upon its results largely depend the fate of silver and tariff reform.

G. G. VEST.

II.—A REPUBLICAN VIEW.

BY SENATOR JOSEPH N. DOLPH, OF OREGON.

THE action of the President in calling a special session of Congress for August 7 has met with general approval. Leaving out of consideration the necessity for financial legislation, an early session of Congress was desirable. It would be well if every session of Congress were to meet not later than October 1. Under the present arrangement the long sessions are necessarily protracted into mid-summer, to the great discomfort and often at the expense of the health of members, and at every short session important measures, upon which much time and labor have been expended, fail to receive final consideration, and indispensable legislation, to the great detriment of the public interests, is often hurried through without sufficient examination and opportunity for discussion.

The next Congress will be one of the most important since the Civil War. For the first time in a third of a century the Democratic party is in full control of the legislative and executive departments of the Government. It is pledged to reverse the policy upon which the Government has been conducted for more than thirty years. The results of the changes which will no doubt be made in our tariff laws will greatly affect our varied industries and the prosperity of our people. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party of protection confidently expect that any legislation in the direction of free trade will result, as it claims such legislation has always resulted in this country, in business stagnation, suspension of industries, financial disturbances, unemployed labor and general bankruptcy; while the Democratic party assert that the abandonment of the protective system will cause increased development of our resources and will promote national and individual prosperity.

One can only judge as to what legislatiou will be enacted during the next Congress by the record and official declarations of the party in power. That the Administration and the majority in Congress will be far more conservative than the country had reason to expect is already apparent. Responsibility produces conservatism.

There will be many questions of minor importance which will no doubt give rise to extended and possibly heated discussion in the next Congress. Among them may be enumerated the proposition to admit Utah, Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma as States of the Union, the immigration question, the Anti-Option measure and the proposed repeal of the Federal Elections law; but the absorbing questions upon which public interest will be centred and upon the correct decision of which the future prosperity of the country will largely depend are the tariff and financial questions.

Upon the tariff question the parties are squarely at issue. The general character of the tariff legislation of the next Congress may be predicted with certainty; but the extent to which the attack upon the protective system will be carried it is more difficult to foretell.

The declaration of the Chicago Convention upon the tariff question was radical enough to require the complete abrogation of the protective policy. The success of the party upon such a platform apparently indicates that the people have empowered the Democratic party to lay the axe at the root of the system; but it is evident that the Democratic leaders either lack confidence in the Democratic theory or courage to put that theory into practice.

Whatever tariff legislation is enacted will be in the direction of free trade. Duties upon many manufactured articles and probably on agricultural products will be decreased. What are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

denominated by free-traders raw materials, including wool, lumber, coal, lead ore and similar articles, will be placed upon the free list. The sugar bounty will be removed, the tin-plate industry destroyed, and many articles now on the free list will be made dutiable. To satisfy Louisiana Democrats a duty will be placed on sugar, and to secure sufficient revenue resort will probably be had to increased internal taxation. Internal taxation is the most unpopular and burdensome of all taxation, and the proposition to impose an income tax will meet with opposition in both parties. Already a proposition for the abrogation of our reciprocity treaties, which will be necessary if sugar, tea and coffee are to be placed on the dutiable list, is being considered.

The financial question, in the estimation of the Administration, is the one upon which legislation is most urgent. The tariff question, which was placed foremost in the Presidential campaign, has been relegated to the rear. While upon proposed tariff legislation party lines will be strictly drawn, upon financial questions the case will be different. The President is in favor of a sound currency and of maintaining the gold basis. He is opposed to free coinage, in favor of the repeal of the Sherman law and discontinuing the purchase of silver. The majority of his party are in favor of the free coinage of silver. It remains to be seen whether Mr. Cleveland can control the Democratic majority and force them to his views.

Not every one who is opposed to the free coinage of silver will favor the repeal of the Sherman law. All do not look upon that law as the cause of all our financial troubles or upon its repeal as the remedy for all our financial ills. What effect the repeal of the Sherman law and the consequent depreciation of the price of silver bullion would have on our financial condition cannot be predicted with certainty; but it should be remembered that confidence in the ability of the Government to maintain the parity of value between the gold and silver dollar does not depend alone upon the volume of our silver currency as compared with the provision made for its redemption in gold, but depends also upon the relation between the intrinsic and par value of the silver dollar.

If the Sherman law is repealed it will be necessary to provide in some manner for an increase of the circulating medium. The unpopularity of the proposition to return to unsound State bank currency is so great that it is doubtful if, standing on its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own merits, the proposition would receive serious consideration in either branch of Congress; but if the issue of Treasury notes for the purchase of silver is discontinued the majority in Congress, in order to provide against a ruinous contraction of the r culating medium, may be compelled to adopt the expedient of State bank circulation.

It is probable that when the proposition to repeal the Sherman Act is introduced a substitute providing for the free coinage of silver will be offered. If there have not been recent conversions of free-coinage Senators, or if the recent suspension of the free coinage of silver in India does not greatly change the situation, such a provision will pass the Senate, and it may possibly pass the House; but it is not probable that a free-coinage bill would pass either branch of Congress over the President's veto.

There are sufficient causes other than the Sherman law for the present financial disturbances. With a blow to American industries pending in threatened tariff legislation, it is not to be wondered at that there has been a loss of confidence among business men, that importations have been diminished, that manufacturers have curtailed their operations and reduced their purchase of raw materials, that the market for labor has been impaired, and that there has been a general forcing of settlements, which has produced financial stringency, business failures, and the exportation of gold. The resources of this country are so great that the increase of our national obligations a few hundred millions or the decrease of the gold reserve in the Treasury a few millions is no cause for alarm. So long as the people have confidence in the intention of the government to maintain its currency, whether silver or paper, at par with gold, treasury notes and silver currency will pass current at their face. The fear of legislation hostile to our industries, or calculated to impair the credit of the government, has more to do with the business and financial condition of the country to-day than the purchase of silver, the condition of the Treasury or the volume of any kind of our currency.

The present financial disturbances are largely due to distrust of the Democratic party, and were precipitated by the predictions of the Democratic press and Democratic politicians after the late Presidential election of the disastrous results to follow from the Sherman law, made in a systematic effort to secure the repeal of that law under the Republican administration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For years the Democratic party has been a negative party. It has opposed at one time or another nearly all legislation favored by the party in power. It has encouraged nearly every political-ism and all third-party movements which promised to create dissatisfaction with the dominant party. The election of Mr. Cleveland was the result of the wide-spread discontent caused largely by the persistent attacks of the Democratic party upon the party in power, and the continual magnifying of the ills or the supposed ills of the laboring and agricultural classes. It now finds itself embarrassed by its connection with third-party organization, and its real or supposed sympathy with their visionary theories. The division of political patronage with its allies is a matter of embarrassment, and the conservative course which the party will be compelled to adopt will drive the dissatisfied elements from its ranks.

It would have been better for the country if Congress had been convened immediately after March 4, and the financial and tariff measures proposed by the Administration laid before Congress and the people; but with apparently no settled convictions on the part of the Democratic leaders as to what should be done, with a demand by the rank and file of the party for radical tariff legislation and a knowledge on the part of the Democratic leaders that this demand could not be satisfied, with conflicting views among the majority in Congress on the Silver question, perhaps, from a Democratic standpoint, the postponement of the meeting of Congress was a political necessity.

No factious opposition will be made by Republicans in either branch of Congress to the tariff or financial measures formulated by the majority. Time will be taken for thorough discussion and Republicans will place themselves before the country in opposition to every assault upon the protective system; but they will recognize that the responsibility for legislation rests with the majority. They will not be oblivious either to the fact that the logic of the situation indicates that the masses can only be set right upon the tariff question by some experience under free-trade legislation.

J. N. DOLPH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE ANARCHISTS AND PUBLIC OPINION.

The "Volcano of Public Opinion" is popularly supposed to be in a perennially active condition, and all those whose acts and purposes are such as to render a position of sudden elevation not altogether desirable are supposed to be in mortal dread of its terrible crater. We are brought up to the idea that the disapproval of all good people is a far severer penalty than fine or imprisonment, and that when the disapproval intensifies to righteous indignation and abhorrence it is a worse fate than death itself.

For those whose instincts are honorable this is all true enough; there is for them no sting sharper than the contempt of their fellows, save that of self-contempt. But this is the class of men for whom the restraining and constraining force of public opinion is least necessary. The subjective penalties inflicted by their own consciences are generally sufficient—at least they are of all men least in need of objective penalties, whether moral or physical. The "terrible punishment of public reprobation" is often most keenly suffered by those who least deserve it. Its operation is like that of the much-discussed "ranking system" in schools, which bears most oppressively upon those who stand least in need of its stimulus. How many sensitive girls, and boys too, have been goaded to nervous invalidism by this cruel spur, which only tickles the thick hides, or thicker craniums, of those for whose benefit it is especially designed! And how many tender hearts have been broken, how many tender spirits have been crushed, by the overwhelming weight of public disapprobation, deserved or undeserved! Many a soul, otherwise strong and noble, will quail at the derisive hoot of a dirty ruffian who would laugh at hissing multitudes, so long as he were in no physical danger from their wrath and scorn.

For those who actually violate the statutes there still remain penalties other than mere public reprobation, though each succeeding generation sees them growing beautifully less. But for other evil-doers, who contrive to elude the technicalities of the law, it matters not how gross the wrong or how disastrous its consequences, there are generally only the cold shoulder and the finger of scorn—and not always even these; not infrequently their reward is the loud applause of multitudes, which utterly drowns the feeble hissing of the indignant few.

Americans were not satisfied, for instance, with mere disapproval of their erring brothers, the Chicago Anarchists. They actually punished their desperate attempt to overthrow the hospitable roof that sheltered them, and their fiendish slaughter of its gallant defenders, by hanging one in a thousand or so of the murderous ingrates and imprisoning a few more—a punishment which a representative of American executive justice thought too severe, and remitted so far as he was able. For a similar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offence in the early part of the eighteenth century François Ravaillac, a poor attorney, half-crazed by a long term of cruel confinement for debt, was punished by indignant France in the following manner. His right hand, with his assassin's knife bound to it, was put into a furnace of burning sulphur, "when it was in a most terrible manner consumed, at which he cast forth horrible cries, yet he would not confess anything; after which, the executioner having made pincers red hot in the same furnace, they did pinch the brawn of his arms and thighs, the calves of his legs, with other fleshy parts of his body; then they poured into the wounds scalding oil, rosin, pitch, and brimstone melted together; but to make the last act of his tragedy equal in torments to the test, they caused four strong horses to be brought to tear his body in pieces; . . . which done, the fury of the people was so great that they pulled his dismembered carcass out of the executioner's hands, which they dragged up and down the dirt, and, cutting off the flesh with their knives, the bones which remained were brought to the place of execution and there burnt. . . . By the same sentence all his goods were forfeited to the King and his parents banished the realm."*

We have omitted some of the most horrible details of this act of retributive justice out of consideration for the uncalloused sensibilities of the reader. If it was one of the extremes, are we not in this more enlightened age fast approaching the other? But are we prepared to go as far towards the other extreme as the "magnanimous," "independent," "courageous" Governor of Illinois? Some of us, it seems, are thus prepared. Amid the storm of public disapprobation (the only penalty to which Governor Altgeld has thus far been subjected) there is heard, here aud there, a voice of enthusiastic commendation, even outside the Anarchists' camp. A few of the eulogistic terms applied to him are quoted above. It is not certain, however, that he cares for these any more than for the more numerous objurgations—to which, he boasts, he is absolutely impervious. To Governor Altgeld, then, the "Volcano of Public Opinion" is no volcano at all, but a mere pyrotechnic display, which perhaps only entertains him.

I remember once being in a crowded theatre where, in the front row of orchestra chairs, sat a bull-necked individual with a pyramidal head terminating in an apex of obstinacy and self-esteem. Just as the curtain fell at the end of one of the acts something or other, no one knew what, won his stupid approval, and he began to applaud vigorously with both hands and feet. The fact that no one joined in his demonstration, instead of abashing him and reducing him to stillness, only piqued him to redoubled exertions. At first the audience were amused by his hardy effrontery, and rewarded it with good-natured laughter. Soon, however, they began to tire of it, and endeavored to suppress it by hissing. This only made matters worse; the louder they hissed the harder he of the pyramidal head stamped, until at last there was another revulsion, and his "independence" and "courage" were rewarded with renewed laughter, whereat, satisfied with his victory over some thousand, more or less, of American citizens, he consented to subside. Of course he might have been ignominously hustled into the street, but such action would not have been in keeping with the "freedom of thought, feeling and expression" which the spirit of our institutions accords to every citizen.

* From a volume published in 1728.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American people, in general, are now in the stage of indignation with the Governor of Illinois and they are visiting upon him the (in his case) futile punishment of their stern disapproval. But a revulsion in his favor has begun and it is by no means improbable that in the end his "independence" and "courage" may win for him a complete victory over the entire sixty millions of us!

There is something grand and admirable in the spectacle of enormous power forbearing to use it upon insignificance and feebleness. When a regiment of warriors marches through a hostile mob, we admire the soldierly stoicism with which they endure the vilest insults and even minor physical assaults without offering to use the power they possess to drive their insulters shrieking with terror into their alley-ways and dives. When a fearless giant pays no attention to the gibes of a gang of cowardly hoodlums we approve his manly dignity. But when the mob begins to throw big stones and fire their revolvers, then our sense of justice and necessity demand of the lion-hearted colonel that he give the stern orders: "Make ready, aim, fire!" And if the hoodlums should transfer their insults from the giant to his wife, then something more is demanded of his manly dignity than cool indifference.

So long as the Anarchists only insult our country, our laws, and our institutions, with vile epithets and minacious fustian, perhaps the national dignity is best preserved by treating them with magnanimous contempt, but when they actually tear down our flag, put the torch to our houses and the knife to our throats, then it is time to apply a sterner penalty. But when the duly appointed representative of our self-protecting power uses his prerogative to remit the just penalty we inflict, and we find that the punishment we impose upon him, our severe disapprobation, only calls forth his derision, what are we "going to do about it?"

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

POSSIBILITIES OF PRAYER.

CONSIDERING how long prayer has been in use in the world and how much human energy it has engrossed, it seems a remarkable thing that there should continue to be such uncertainty about its effects. When a boy throws a ball over a wall, he cannot tell precisely where it is going to land, but he is sure it went over and that it will hit something. When a doctor gives medicine he cannot be certain of its effect until the patient has shown it, and he cannot always be sure then; nevertheless he knows the medicine was an actual force and that it did something, though other forces may have neutralized its action. But when a man of average sentiments prays, he is not sure whether or not anything has gone out from him which has had any effect outside of his own range of perception. He is sure that his own mind has worked in a certain manner. If other persons have heard him pray, he may be convinced that his uttered sentiments have affected their minds, but beyond that everything is foggy and uncertain.

That is an unsatisfactory state of things, with which prayerful persons ought not to be satisfied. If prayer is worth using at all, and great numbers of intelligent people are convinced that it is, it is worth using with the utmost intelligence and the highest attainable skill. The kind of prayer in which the petitioner asks for everything he can think of, in the hope that some of his supplications may reach the mark, is as much out of date as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those doses affected by doctors of the last generation, in which a lot of drugs were mixed, not for their combined effect, but in the hope that the right one might be among them, and might find its way to the right spot in the patient. Perhaps clumsy doctors do that way still. Not so the masters of medicine. Their diagnoses make plain to them what they want to do; then if they use a drug at all, it is sent to accomplish that particular purpose. So, in this enlightened generation, the prayers of the great prayer-masters should be rifle shots sent by an understood force at an ascertained mark, Whether they hit or miss should depend upon comprehensible conditions. If a savage fires at the moon with a rifle, he may be surprised at not hitting it; but a man who understands about rifles is not surprised. He knows what may be expected of them. So it would seem it should be possible to understand prayer.

There are forces of nature which used to be mysterious, but which the men of our day can use and control, because they have learned how. If there are natural forces which can be reached or directed by prayer, it is not unimaginable that human intelligence may gain a more definite use, and some measure of control of them also. Men pray to God, but there is no natural force that the idea of God does not include. The more rational idea of prayer would seem to be not an argument or entreaty which influences the sentiments of the Deity, but a force which acts directly on some force which is included in God. Of prayer so considered it is as obvious a necessity that the results it seeks should accord with God's will as that the results expected from the control of other natural forces should accord with the laws of nature. Men do not expect water to run up hill and turn a mill wheel. They have found out that water runs down hill. But if the use of water was still in the experimental stage, they might put their mill wheels at various points to see what results they got. Until they learned the laws of nature as they affect water, water-power would continue to be a mysterious and uncertain force.

Prayer is still in the experimental stage. We know that it is of no use as a force, except so far as it conforms to the will of God. Yet many of us believe that it brings things to pass which would not happen without it. Electricity works in accordance with the will of God when it hauls a street car, but it would not haul the car except for the interposition of the will of man. So we constantly use prayer as though it were an objective force, subject to the will of man in accordance with the will of God. We are pretty sure that the will of God, including and regulating all natural forces, is invariable, not subject to whims or open to argument or entreaty. When we pray, then, we do not hope to alter God's will, but rather for the application to a special case of some force whose existence is suspected rather than understood, which is included, as are all natural forces, in God, but which, like other forces, is subject to our will in proportion as we understand the laws that govern it. But we don't seem to know enough about prayer yet to adapt our methods with any certainty to its possibilities. We set up our mill wheels and wait to see which way the force tends, and whether or not it will turn them. We string our wires, but don't quite know how to get the electricity into them. We cannot gear our wants by prayer to the great central force so as to get our necessities satisfied. When we have more nearly perfected our knowledge of prayer, and of the will of God, we will, perhaps, be able to do that very thing. Then, when we see a comet coming our way we may be able to pray our planet out of its course

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as easily as we steer a ship out of the course of another and avoid a collision. Then, when we are in such a predicament as were the passengers of the disabled "Spree," we can count with some certainty upon calm seas and succor from the nearest ship.

Man is not the supreme force of the Universe, but he is akin to it. He shares its quality. All things are possible to him if only he can learn how. If he can ever become the reverent master of scientific prayer, we may expect to see the rate of his progress indefinitely accelerated. The incurable will be cured then; the impracticable will be done; the secret of perpetual motion will be revealed; the fountain of youth will gush out. The millennium will have come then, but only for those who have learned to know it.

EDWARD S. MARTIN.

OUR COMING RIVAL.

IT WILL probably be conceded by everyone that the present prosperity of the United States as a nation is caused mainly by our having a large surplus of food products which Europe requires, and from the fact that we do not need their manufactures. We can get along without them, and we do our best to keep them out. These two things or conditions combined with an inter-state trade entirely free have built up great wealth for the country, but it has been done too much at the expense of the farmer and laborer. They have also shared in the general prosperity, but not in proportion with others. It is scarcely credible that the most enthusiastic friends of our present tariff really believe that the farmer is benefited by it. One thing alone shows clearly that he is a victim. He sells his products for less than European prices, while almost everyone else gets more than European prices for his time or produce.

This is bad, but the future seems to have worse in store for the farmer, and it seems as if the present system might before long spoil the farmers' foreign market, and swamp the laborer with a sea of forced immigration. There is at present only one country in the world that looms up as a serious rival to the United States in food products. Almost without commercial railroad facilities, without farm machinery, without decent cultivation, without any country banks to move crops, and with her magnificent wheat fields hardly touched, Russia has been close after the United States in the markets of the world. If this is conceded and it cannot be denied, what might we not expect of her with our advantages?

Russia possesses both in Europe and in Asia the largest and most excellent regions of wheat land yet untouched on the face of the earth, requiring nothing but capital, cultivation and railroad facilities to produce a surplus sufficient to feed Europe without calling on America for a single bushel of wheat. The Russian oil fields rival those of Pennsylvania, and the great plains can feed millions of horses and cattle. England has been looking at Russia through green spectacles for over a century, and Russia has been trying to overreach her at every opportunity. Each nation has done and is doing all it can to thwart and injure the other at all times and in all places. How much this is done is not generally known. As it is now, the British capitalist would rather invest anywhere than in Russia, and the Russian diplomatist never finds one of his Eastern schemes countermined without blaming his English brother. Only intense mutual jealousy could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have prevented the two nations so long from seeing that each was the natural complement of the other—that each had what the other lacked, and that, working in harmony, each could expand to an unlimited extent without interfering with the other. As it is, England stands in the way of Russian progress. She seems unable to realize that it is as futile to try to prevent a great people from reaching the sea as it would be to stop an Alaska glacier on its way to the Pacific Ocean.

It has not yet occurred to England that Russia can have all she really wants without harming the British Empire. Russia doesn't want India, but she does want Constantinople, and a free outlet through the Bosphorus. She also wants her own sea-board on the Persian Gulf, and she threatens India as the most effective way to gain these points. Suppose our present attitude on the tariff question should rub the scales from their eyes and should develop an English statesman able to look at things as they are, and not as he has them pictured from the traditions and prejudices of his fathers, and he should say to Russia: "You take Constantinople and Persia; we will keep Egypt and India. We will furnish capital to build your railroads and open up your wheat and oil fields. We will take your produce and give you our manufactures in exchange." That would, indeed, be a great combination and it would soon embrace more than these two nations. England could make no better bargain than this. She would be in no wise injured by giving Russia what she wanted, and with Russia as her ally would possess her own Oriental realms in peace and quiet. Russia having secured the needed outlets, and having secured a large infusion of English blood, brains and money, would surprise the world with her wonderful growth and output. This would be stealing our thunder and improving on our special patent "reciprocity," but who shall say that we may not see this thing done? If it is, the future for our farmer is worse than the present.

Our farmer sells on the basis of Liverpool prices in the market of the world. He buys home productions at a protected price, and thus he is hit both ways. The manufacturer sells his goods at his own-protected price, and, as a matter of fact, no matter how it may be glossed over, hires his laborer in the markets of the world as cheaply as possible, and thus he profits on both sides. It would appear certain from these considerations that the farmer is not the man benefited by the tariff, and the ordinary laborer is nearly as much the victim as the farmer, for the very protection that excludes foreign products from our shores forces the foreign worker to emigrate here when labor is already in excess, and adds to the army of the unemployed, and reduces the pay of those employed.

Our English customer and consumer who was living there comfortably, using our products and paying for them, now gets out of work and comes over here to live in, or on, this country as best he may. The home market that the tariff-makers boast of is increased by the addition of men who, at home, were buying our products and paying for them just as much and even more than they do if they come here.

It appears to be a clear proposition that the farmer, to say the least of it, is contributing more than his share towards the national prosperity. If it be true that it is better that a hundred guilty men should escape rather than that one innocent man should suffer, it is surely unjust that one class, and that the largest in the land, should suffer for the general weal; but how much greater is the injustice, if it is not for the general good. The best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

friends of our present tariff do not deny that it is supremely selfish, and in fact they boast of that phase of it. They appear to forget that there is an enlightened selfishness, and a selfishness that defeats its own ends. Our present tariff has antagonized Eastern Europe. It is the old adage: "Might makes right." We don't really need their products, and we have pretty nearly closed the door on them; but they must have our wheat, beef and oil, so we are not afraid of reprisals, and we act as if we thought that this condition of things would be eternal. England in particular would rather trade with us and put her money into enterprises here than anywhere else, but when we say to her, we don't want your wares, but you must take our products, can we expect that a great and wealthy nation will quietly accept the situation, close its factories and build new poor-houses? It is not in the nature of things that such should be the case. It may be all right just at present, but some combination will be formed to equalize things, and if so, what will be the consequence to our farmers? It is at least possible that we are sacrificing the future for the sake of present gain. The Golden Rule is out of fashion in these days, but it is generally a broad, far-sighted and paying plan to follow it.

WILLIAM SELBIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED